DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 990 HE 012 939

TITLE Church and College: A Vital Partnership. Volume 2: Mission--A Shared Vision of Educational Purpose.
INSTITUTION Austin Coll., Sherman, Tex. Center for Program and Institutional Renewal.; National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities, Sherman, Tex.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 178p.; For related documents see HE 012 938-041.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Church Related Colleges; *Church Role; College Curriculum; *College Role; *Educational Objectives; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Poverty; Racial Bias; Religious Education; School Community Relationship; *Social Action; Social Change

ABSTRACT

In the two-year period 1979-80, the National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities was a cooperative effort of 23 denominations to examine the issues facing their institutions of higher education. The significant papers and events appear in this and three other volumes. Contents of this volume include an overview and four other sections. Section Two addresses educational purposes and programs: interdependence and enrichment, distinguishing characteristics, and identity and integrity. Section Three looks at issues of society, and the appropriate academic involvement in social issues through curriculum and other institutional efforts. The issues of racism and poverty are addressed specifically in several articles. Section Four considers forms of relationships between church and college: viable relationships, how they are made, images and expectations. Section Five contains a list of authors and critique authors, and their institutional affiliations. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189990

CHURCH AND COLLEGE: A VITAL PARTNERSHIP

Volume 2: Mission - A Shared Vision of Educational Purpose

A Publication of
The National Congress on Church-Related
Colleges and Universities

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dan L. Conseman
Lynn Lebatt
Cong of Univ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE012 939

Published Through
The Center for Program and Institutional Renewal
at Austin College
Sherman, Texas

© 1980, The National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities.
When appropriate acknowledgement is given to the holder of the copyright, this material may be used by others.

CONTENTS

Introduction 5

Section 1: Overview

Chapter 1
An Overview: The Context of Church-Related Colleges and Universities 9

Section 2: Educational Purposes and Programs

Chapter 2
Higher Education and Church: Interdependence and Enrichment 21
David Burrell

Chapter 3
Church-Related Higher Education: Distinguishing Characteristics 29
Harry E. Smith

Chapter 4
Church-Related Colleges and Universities: Identity and Integrity 37
Edgar M. Carlson

Section 3: Issues of Society

Chapter 5
Why Should Church-Related Higher Education Address Itself to Social Issues? 51
Richard P. McBrien

Chapter 6
What Is Appropriate Academic Involvement in Social Issues for the Church-Related College or University? 57
J. Rod Fulcher

Chapter 7
What Is Appropriate Academic Involvement in Social Issues for the Church-Related College or University? The Case of Racism 65
Edward Wright, Jr.

Chapter 8
What Are the Implications for the Church-College Relationship When the College Addresses Itself Academically to Social Issues? 69
Merle Longwood

Chapter 9
How Might the Church-Related College Restructure Its Curriculum to Deal More Effectively With Social Issues? 75
William C. Nelson

Chapter 10
Does the Typical College or University Embody in Itself the Patterns of Domination and Dependency Which Are Present Wherever Societal Problems Like Racism and Poverty Exist? 85
Patrick Hill and Clyce Lee Miller

Chapter 11
Church-Related Higher Education and Social Issues 95
David O'Brien

Section 4: Forms of Relationships Between the Church and College

Chapter 12
Church-College Relationships: Shaping a Faith and Viable Future 105
Robert R. Parsonage

Chapter 13
Effective Church-College Relationships and How They Are Made 131
Dan C. West

Chapter 14
College Relationships in the Lutheran Church in America: A Case of Study 145
Richard W. Solberg

Chapter 15
A Survey of Images and Expectations 167
Prepared by the staff of Search Institute, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Section 5: Contributors 185

INTRODUCTION

For the two-year period 1978-1980 the National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities has been a cooperative effort of twenty-three denominations to examine the issues facing their institutions of higher education. Literally hundreds of people have been involved – nationally recognized church leaders and educational scholars, denominational executives and college officials, lay members of congregations and constituents of colleges, and many others representing a cross-section of those concerned about church-related colleges and universities.

The participants have faced their task in a variety of ways. They have held two national meetings, one at the University of Notre Dame in June 1978 and one in Washington, D.C. in February 1980. They have worked through Study Commissions to address particular issues in depth. And they have, through their individual denominations, designed plans of action to reach out to the broad spectrum of church members and constituents of church-related colleges and universities.

To capture the substance of all the work carried out during the last two years, the National Congress is issuing a set of publications – Church and College: A Vital Partnership – containing the significant papers and a record of events. There are four volumes in this series of publications:

1. *AFFIRMATION – A Shared Commitment for Creative Renewal.* This volume is a summary of the main work thrust of the National Congress. It contains Affirmations about the value and contribution of the church-related college, Action Plans to renew the colleges' ability to face the issues of the future, and an Inventory for Renewal to help colleges and churches alike continually assess their status. This volume also contains a brief description of all National Congress activities and processes, including excerpts from speeches at the two national meetings.

2. *MISSION – A Shared Vision of Educational Purpose*

3. *ACCOUNTABILITY – Keeping Faith with One Another.* These two companion volumes contain the papers developed by the six Study Commissions of the National Congress. The papers cover the six areas of educational purposes and

programs, issues of society, relationships between churches and colleges, legal issues, public policy issues, and financial issues. In each area the papers attempt to define the issue and to identify options for churches and colleges to deal with the issues. Also, an overview statement appears at the first of Volume 2. It describes the general framework of church-related colleges and is the base from which the Study Commissions delved into their areas of specific issues. Having the overview eliminated the need for each Commission to repeat basic conditions and provided a common predicate from which all began their work.

These papers are significant in themselves, but they have also served other useful functions for the National Congress. For the Notre Dame meeting, they were the basis of discussion sessions and the means to acquaint many individuals with the issues concerning church-related colleges. For the Washington meeting, they were the primary resource from which the meeting's documents were drawn – the Affirmations, Action Plans, and Inventory for Renewal. Through the development and discussion of the Affirmations, Action Plans, and Inventory, the National Congress synthesized the papers of all six Commissions and brought focus to its overall work. That kind of integrating statement would not have been possible, however, without the original sources to draw upon.

4. *EXCHANGE – Sharing Resources for Renewal.* This volume contains information of two kinds: first, a bibliography of recent books and published articles about church-related higher education, and second, a bibliography of materials on church-related higher education available through denominations and colleges. This volume is perhaps the most extensive bibliography on church-related higher education.

The participants in the National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities hope that these publications are both a contribution to the study of higher education and a resource that helps church-related colleges and college-related churches face the future with vitality and purposefulness.

SECTION I
Overview

Chapter I

AN OVERVIEW: THE CONTEXT OF CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES*

Today's context of church-related colleges and universities is vastly different from that of a few years ago. Moreover, the context continues to change and at a rate which challenges one's ability to keep pace.

The importance of recognizing and understanding the context, however, is crucial. The issues facing church-related colleges – their problems and opportunities – are in large measure defined and shaped by the context in which the colleges exist. To address those issues effectively, one must comprehend that context, including recent developments in the field of higher education, changes relating to church-related colleges and universities, their current situation, and various societal factors having implications for the future. Some of these factors relate to changes occurring in the churches, such as reorganizations and pressures for new mission opportunities, and have implications ranging far beyond the church-related colleges. Although these pressures impinge more directly on the churches than on the colleges, they do in many cases compete for attention with the church-related colleges. The focus of this overview, however, is specifically on the changing conditions facing the church-related colleges.

Growth and Expansion in Three Decades

In 1950 all colleges and universities in the United States enrolled approximately 2.5 million students. By the end of the 1970s enrollment had swelled to more than 11 million students. These figures dramatize a significant change in higher education during the last three decades – phenomenal growth.

Many factors account for the growth. One of the most important was the "baby boom" after World War II. Another significant factor was renewed emphasis on science and research as a result of Sputnik in 1957. Still another factor came in the next decade when the nation, responding to the civil rights movement, adopted the public policy of unrestricted access to educational opportunity. The role of women began changing, too, and the percentage of women continuing their

* This overview was prepared through a process of review by the Executive Committee, the Study Commissions, and the staff of the National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities.

education beyond high school increased. The culmination of the impact of these and other factors came in the mid 1960s when a new college was established every week. Enrollment, then at approximately 5 million, was to double in the next fifteen years. This expansion changed the composition and characteristics of the student bodies in colleges and universities.

The same public policy that emphasized access also focused on lifelong learning. Section 131 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 states, "American society should have as a goal the availability of appropriate opportunities for lifelong learning for all its citizens without regard to restrictions of previous education . . . or economic circumstances." This policy was recognition that needs of business and industry called for certain types of training not provided by colleges, and those needs combined with the public policy to foster an expansion of post-secondary education. Today approximately 17 million people are pursuing education outside traditional college and university classes and courses.

Thus, the period from 1950 to 1979 has had unprecedented impact on the nation's colleges and universities. Not only has the traditional enrollment multiplied nearly sevenfold, but also the concept of higher education has been expanded to include all of post-secondary education.

The Changing Enrollment of the Independent College Sector, Including Church-Related Colleges

Church-related colleges and universities enjoyed some of the same growth and expansion during the last three decades as other sectors of higher education, but not in the same proportion. For example, in 1950 all independent institutions, including church-related colleges and universities, enrolled approximately 50% of all higher education students. By 1979 that percentage had decreased to 25%. The enrollment figures increased in real numbers, but the comparative percentages declined. These same institutions, however, were doing more than their part in terms of granting degrees. By 1979, although they only enrolled 25% of the students, they granted 34% of all earned degrees. This figure indicates both the growth environment and the success of these colleges in recruiting and retaining students.

Mass and Diversity in the Church-College Sector Today

Participating groups in the 1978-1980 National Congress on Church-

Related Colleges and Universities included the bulk of college-sponsoring bodies. The twenty-three denominations and church groups were represented with combined church membership of approximately 100 million people, and they sponsored or were associated with some 600 colleges and universities.

Still, the National Congress of 1978-1980 did not include all church-related institutions of higher education. When all church-related colleges, universities, and seminaries are included, the figures become even more impressive. These institutions enroll approximately 1.2 million students and have annual operating funds totaling about $6.8 billion. Total assets (land, buildings, equipment, endowment) are about $15.3 billion. These figures illustrate the magnitude of the church-related sector of higher education.

The nature of the mass is important also. Church-related colleges and universities are a diverse lot. A 1974 publication of the Association of American Colleges described the diversity of the entire independent sector.

> They range in size from a few hundred to more than 30,000 students. They vary in function from small liberal arts colleges and specialized professional schools to great universities with elaborate graduate and professional programs. Some emphasize occupational interest, others liberal studies. They range in clientele from those serving particular ethnic or religious groups or particular local areas to those serving a broad spectrum of the population. Most are of the latter type. They vary in location, some being rural, some suburban, some urban. They vary in their philosophy of education and in the nature of their educational impact. Some are four-year colleges, and some two-year. They include institutions of great fame and influence as well as little-known institutions which serve specialized or local needs. Some cater to students of exceptional ability, and some to those of more modest ability. Some are heavily engaged in research and public service, while others concentrate on instruction. Some are residential, and some serve primarily commuting students.

As is the case in the entire independent sector, the church-college sector exhibits healthy variety. Indeed, in just numbers of institutions, it contributes more than half of that diversity.

Recognition of the differences among institutions is important. Too often it is easy to stereotype all colleges, and citizens even sometimes fail to see any distinguishing differences between state-sponsored and independent or church-related institutions. There are indeed different kinds of programs and different kinds of educational choices for the student. Diversity exists both within the entire range of educational institutions and within the church-college sector, and that diversity is an important result of the existence of the church-related college. The mass and diversity of all church-related colleges and universities demonstrate the contribution made to the nation and to higher education by these institutions.

Impinging Societal Factors

The context of church-related colleges is the larger society in which they operate. Changes are occurring in that society which have implications for the colleges, and these changes and implications must be recognized if the colleges are to carry out their most effective role and program in the present and the future. Moreover, the churches have an obligation to help shape the future, and the recognition of change affecting their institutions can move them toward meeting that obligation.

Changes could be grouped according to external and internal factors, but the classification of each into one or the other category is subject to debate. Also, there are substantial interrelationships among the factors, and those interrelationships must be recognized.

The factors which follow have implications for the immediate and long-term future. The challenge is to try to envision that future. Space colonization, holograms in the home (three-dimensional communication), different kinds of energy usage, experiments in human cloning – these and other issues may shape life in the twenty-first century. With such changes perhaps developing in the distant future, what are the educational needs and implications of the future that church-related colleges should address?

1. *Consensus about future society is lacking.* During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries there was general agreement concerning the new world being shaped for the future. Such clarity of vision no longer exists, and the former sense of coherence has been diffused.

The current lack of consensus offers an opportune time for church-related colleges to help society envision the future, determine the kind of future desired, and bring that future into reality. It is also appropriate for the colleges to re-examine and perhaps clarify their purposes and

missions. For example, the spread of religion was a prime motivation when churches founded colleges in earlier days, but other concerns may be at the heart of the church-related college in the future.

2. *Cultural values of society are now expressed and carried forward in time by a variety of institutions.* Previously churches took a lone stand to communicate and preserve values they held dear. Many social movements and institutions are now concerned with values, including the arts and secular humanism. Competing values are also gaining increasing support, such as the emphasis on quantifiable techniques and knowledge.

Although it is laudable that others are also contributing to inculcating some values which formerly was done primarily by the churches and their colleges, nevertheless the situation also presents a dilemma. The church-related colleges are challenged to distinguish between the values of secular humanism and Christian values. The colleges can be an exceptional environment for examining values, and the present time is a rich opportunity because many individuals are engaged in personal quests for basic values. Particular concerns of colleges may be the emphasis on moral and spiritual development and the offering of educational programs designed to present and foster Christian values.

3. *The postindustrial society is coming of age.* The number of manufacturing workers is declining while those who work with data, information, and knowledge are increasing. Traditional industrial jobs are decreasing, and in the future more jobs will be at the professional, technological, managerial, and service level. These shifts reflect the continuing knowledge explosion. For example, it is estimated that one-half of what an engineer knows will be outdated in five years.

The emergence of the postindustrial society is one reason for the increasing emphasis on lifelong learning and the learning society. For the church-related colleges it raises questions about the nature of educational programs best suited to serve the needs of both society and individuals within that society. Another implication for colleges is the issue of recognizing learning achieved outside the traditional college program and classroom. Already the American Council of Education has visited eighty business, labor, and government organizations which offer education and has assessed credit value for 1,000 courses. Another force is the military which has a goal of recruiting one of every four high school graduates and thus represents a potentially vast reservoir of learning outside the traditional college.

4. *The population of the United States is aging.* The widely discussed "crunch" on the pool of traditional college-age students is beginning,

with the nation now entering that period of annual decreases in the segment of the population aged 18 to 24. The Census Bureau estimates that there will be 3.8 million fewer individuals in the traditional college-age group in 1990 than there are now, and that the decreased numbers will continue through the mid 1990s. At the same time, the "baby boom" generation will become middle-aged and the average age of the population will become older.

The implications of the demographic picture are apparent. Colleges will find it difficult to maintain enrollments (and therefore tuition income) with the traditional college-age group. Church-related colleges may be particularly vulnerable because they do not have the source of legislative appropriations on which state-sponsored institutions can rely. Further implications include how to help society meet the needs of a larger generation of older Americans.

5. *The economic situation remains uncertain, with individuals increasingly feeling economic pressures.* Questions abound about whether the economy can continue to grow in real terms or is facing a period of steady-state. At the same time, continuing inflation challenges individuals just to meet the costs of living, much less to "get ahead."

The uncertain economic situation is already felt on campuses with the push for career and vocational education and predictions that there will be a surplus of 800,000 college graduates by 1985 – this despite the fact that there is evidence that employers want the overall competent person rather than a highly specialized worker. Another implication is the blending of education and work thoughout one's life because of the need to earn a living while at the same time attending school. Already the majority of college students are over 22 years old, and more and more students are taking longer than four years to complete the bachelor's degree. Still another implication comes from the uncertain economic picture in combination with the decreases in college-age students – a surplus of faculty members. Pressures for faculty collective bargaining and for faculty development programs can both be attributed in part to decreasing opportunities and mobility for faculty.

6. *Technology is becoming ever more complex and is playing a larger and larger role in society.* Micro-electronics, computing, lasers, high-speed communications, genetic engineering, and many other terms indicate the impact technology is having on everyday life. The future promises more changes in this area.

These changes raise important issues for the colleges. Delivery systems for education are immediately called into question. Video recorders, satellite receivers, and computer terminals in the home are but

some delivery systems that traditional education must face. At the same time, colleges must cope with the value assumptions which do and should undergird technology usage.

7. *Public policy changes are occurring in government regulations, taxation, and other legal issues.* Affirmative action, Social Security, OSHA, and other terms bring to mind a myriad of complex procedures mandated by public policy. Other developments in tax laws have had the effect of decreasing the incentive for charitable contributions. For example, one study shows that the expansion of the standard deduction is correlated with a decline in charitable giving by individuals. Finally, in general, there are increasing litigation and regulation throughout society, and higher education is not immune to them.

The public policy changes are combining to put increased financial pressure on church-related colleges. While the costs of meeting regulations are increasing the financial burden, taxation developments are decreasing sources of financial support. In addition, the colleges may be especially affected by public policy because the need for financial resources brings pressure to act in the way that brings in public money. This situation can place the colleges in conflict with their value commitments. Most important, all public policy developments are requiring more careful work and analysis by the colleges.

8. *Consumerism is a growing concern.* For some time, business and commercial enterprises have been facing increasing demands to provide reliable products and services. Now the movement is spreading into other areas, including the field of education. Consumers want to know and are gaining the right to know what they can expect for the prices they pay.

The implication for colleges is accountability. Claims in advertising and recruiting must be factual, and a new emphasis on quantifiable measurements of the results of education is increasing. For example, one bill has already been introduced in Congress that would require colleges to publish their retention rates, one measure of success. Pressures for accountability will grow.

9. *The traditionally vibrant, private, non-profit sector of society is showing signs of weakening.* Statistics on the private non-profit sector are impressive at first glance: over 400,000 institutions (350,000 religious organizations, 1,500 colleges and universities, plus various others), a work force of 5 million (5% of total), ownership of 10% of all property in the United States, annual expenditures of more than $80 billion, annual time volunteered of nearly six billion hours (according to one poll, one out of every four people over 14 years of age, with over 50%

of the time given to churches and synagogues), annual contributions received totaling more than $30 billion (80% from individuals and 54% of that from households earning less than $20,000 per year). The pressures, however, are seen in comparative figures. Giving by individuals as a proportion of personal income has dropped 15% since 1960, and the total, in real terms, is $8 billion less. Much giving, too, is highly individualized and specific. The creation of a new organization, the Council for Non-Profit Voluntary Organizations headed by John Gardner, is evidence of the concern.

With pressures on the non-profit sector, church-related colleges face restraints on their sources of support. Church benevolent budgets are strained, in turn causing pressure for the colleges. Moreover, the pressure on volunteerism is an especially relevant concern for church-related colleges because of their value orientation to "doing for others."

10. *Massiveness and institutionalization are increasing in society, causing feelings of alienation.* The human scale is in danger of being ignored. Pressures on the family and the neighborhood are increasing the problem. The sense of an individual's belonging in a community with others may be threatened.

The church-related colleges and universities have traditionally tried to structure a distinctive environment where there are dignity and concern for each person. In many cases this includes a residential campus. Trends in society and the hard decisions required in times of financial constraint are challenging the traditional community concept. In the future the colleges may have to put greater efforts into creating such an environment and in fostering a sense of community among those on their campuses.

11. *Different lifestyles will probably be a fact for the future.* Pressures on natural resources and growing realization of global interdependence may mean that the United States, with 6% of the world's population, cannot continue to consume 30-40% of the world's natural resources. Increasing reference to alignment of the world's nations as North/South (developed/developing) instead of East/West (totalitarian/free) reflects the issue.

This factor has at least two important implications for colleges. First, different lifestyles can apply to institutions as well as individuals, and the colleges will have to re-examine their styles of operating. Second, education about new lifestyles may be necessary, and the colleges, with inspiration from the churches, could play a key role in helping individuals understand the need for new lifestyles and incorporate them in their behavior. Simpler ways of realizing personal and institutional

aspirations will have to be considered.

12. *The attitudes and expectations of people, especially the church constituency, are in some cases a cause for concern.* On the one hand, the Gallup Poll reports that among all key institutions in the United States, the church or organized religion enjoys the highest amount of confidence by the people (44% a "great deal"), much higher than that for the military, public schools, the presidency, the Supreme Court, Congress, big business, or labor unions. On the other hand, public confidence in the value of higher education has declined, and at least one church survey reveals a significant lack of information about church-related colleges by the church constituency.

The most important implication for church-related colleges may be awareness of the need for communication with their constituencies. Increased efforts may be called for to provide the information necessary so that the people have full understanding of the role, position, problems, and challenges of the colleges. Most important, the colleges may have to increase their own understanding of the need and desirability to having well-defined constituencies.

Conclusion

The context of church-related colleges and universities is far-ranging and complex. Some of the major factors have been identified above, but there is no claim that these factors cover the entire spectrum. Similarly, there may be variance in the applicability of each factor to a particular college. For example, demographic trends can vary for different sections of the country. Despite the differences, however, the colleges must at least be aware of the context in which they operate if they are to deal effectively with the issues confronting them.

Collectively, the papers of the Study Commissions represent the attempt of participants in the National Congress to face the challenges of the larger context aggressively and creatively. The facts of the situation can be dealt with constructively and in a positive way, and that is the approach taken in the papers. Options are presented, and effective methods of handling various issues are described. Together, the papers offer many exciting opportunities for church-related colleges and universities.

SOURCES

Carlson, Edgar. *The Future of Church-Related Higher Education*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1977.

Elam, Stanley M., ed. *A Decade of Gallup Polls of Attitudes Toward Education: 1969-78*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1979. (As reviewed by Beverly T. Watkins in February 26, 1979 issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. 18)

"The Federal Stake in a Learning Society: An Interview with Ernest L. Boyer," *Change*, 10 (May, 1978), 21-5.

Gallup Poll on Religious Attitudes. Reported in *Journal of Current Social Issues*, Spring, 1977.

Higher Education Act of 1965.

Liberal Education, Vol. 62, May, 1976. Entire volume devoted to "Looking to the Future: Liberal Education in a Radically Changing Society," Proceedings and Papers from the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges.

Magarrell, J. "Enrollment Roller Coaster: Colleges Fear the Big Dip," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 17 (Sept. 5, 1978), 1+.

McKeever, Porter. "The Third Sector." An address given to the Arkansas Community Foundation, December 4, 1978.

A National Policy for Private Higher Education. The report of a Task Force of the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1974. (excerpt from p. 9)

"National Project IV, Examining the Varieties of Liberal Education." Booklet of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Program Information and Application, 1978.

"Options in Education." National Public Radio, April 19, 1977.

"Report from the Fund, Collaborations for Combining Career and Liberal Education." Booklet of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, 1978.

Solberg, Richard W. "The Basis for Partnership Between Church and College, and the Survey of Images and Expectations of LCA Colleges." An Address at a Regional Conference, October 30, 1978.

Smith, Harry E. "Where Are We in Higher Education?" – Issues and Pressures Facing Higher Education and the Church Today. Speech at Higher Education Consultation of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, January 26-28, 1976.

West, Dan C. "Presbyterians and the Presbyterian Church." Speech to the Synod of Red River, Presbyterian Church in the United States, September 27, 1977.

SECTION II

Educational Purposes and Programs

Chapter 2

HIGHER EDUCATION AND CHURCH: INTERDEPENDENCE AND ENRICHMENT

David Burrell

What is the church doing in the business of higher education? Even when we recognize that the church permeates all of life and of society, we can still ask more precisely: What business is it of hers? Of if we accept the fact that our churches have been involved in this work for a long time as adequate justification for our existence, what are those of us in colleges and universities doing to reflect the church's engagement?

Reasons for the Church's Involvement in Higher Education

If we try to deal with the first question first – why is the church engaged in higher education? – we find different denominations offering different reasons. A recent study of church-related colleges and universities suggests three different "models" to gather three characteristic responses: An *embodying* college reflects the church, a *proclaiming* college witnesses for the church, and a *consonant* college is an ally of the church.[1] These differences reflect distinct histories and sometimes specific theological attitudes relating church to world. Yet they only make sense against a common background.

Faith and Learning

It is the *fact* of church involvement in higher education that stands out above all. The tradition we can commonly claim reaches back to the medieval universities and beyond these to the cathedral schools and monastic *studia* of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. While he was a monk of Bec, Anselm of Canterbury mastered the rigors of logic in between common recitation of the psalms and daily reading of the scriptures. He also took the opportunity to work through the collected works of Augustine, whose writings provided a pattern for the early Middle Ages. Jean Leclerc paints a colorful picture of this period in a fascinating account which reads like a novel, *Love of Learning and the Desire for God* (New York, 1967). People of the church reached out for learning in a movement as spontaneous as their desire to serve their God.

Spontaneity is not everything, of course. Bernard also warned his monks against the perils of idle curiosity. Yet holy men and women offered ways of using study to bring mind and heart closer to God: Bonaventure wrote *The Mind's Way to God*. If we could overcome the tendency to think ourselves better for all we know and let our mind and heart marvel in God's creation, we will find them leading the individual to joy in whatever is good, beautiful, and true. What better road to a discovery of the creator of heaven and earth? So spontaneity does testify to a great deal. The search for God and the search for truth belong together.

The conviction of Jews and Christians alike is that the creator of the universe also guides our individual destinies. Thus, the native bent of God's creatures will be to rejoice in learning because the God present in creation is also active in redemption. When our ability to reason can be affirmed to have come from the same source as the gift of our salvation, there is at least the chance that our efforts to redeem the times will be blessed. This affirmation becomes a charter for institutions of higher education: to continue to quest for a compatibility between learning and faith.

It is this conviction of compatibility which has animated the lives of so many believers spent in the service of education. It is this conviction as well which has framed the purposes sacred to higher education: insisting that education is a quest for truth and has the mission to equip successive generations to pursue it. Those involved often betrayed the quest and the mission, to be sure, by shrinking truth to dogmatic formulations and so becoming a countersign to the openhearted seekers of another generation. Even so, their statements continue to hold out an ideal for colleges and universities to fulfill. That is the way with doctrinal statements: They can offer convenient clubs to those who presume to possess them, yet they continue to carry a liberating message for others to make their own and to develop. Jesus' words come to mind, spoken to his disciples regarding the religious teachers of his day: "Practice and observe whatever they tell you, but not what they do" (Mt. 23:3). His instructions to his followers might be echoed by parents to their children and by teachers to their students, for our practice as educators no less than as parents may obscure the truth entrusted to us. We need to guard against letting our formulations of truth become limiting when they should be liberating.

Gaining Knowledge and Seeking Truth

Just as recent scholarship has altered our estimate of the scribes and

pharisees, however, so recent experience with higher education offers new possibilities for church involvement and inspiration. We have come to realize that higher education can fully occupy itself with *extending knowledge* and find neither time nor heart for *questing after truth*. The sacred rhetoric which associated the work with a quest and a mission is indeed sacred. It comes from that spontaneous sympathy between learning and the love of God which inspired schools and universities from their beginning in the West. Once centers of learning have been cut off from a church life which celebrates that sympathy, however, they can no longer be assured of a center, claim a mission, or confirm a quest. Extending the frontiers of knowledge need not be described as searching for the truth. It does not even need to include a responsibility for *passing on* the best our civilization has had to offer. Reference to universities as "knowledge factories" offers some indications of the extent to which inertia can carry an institution.

We have begun to see clearly what our own teachers might have thought they could take for granted: that higher education requires a yet higher context if it is to live up to its stated goals. The generation before us could adopt unconsciously a language steeped in tradition. They sometimes even thought of themselves and of higher education as having *been* animated by religious ideals, but now "come of age." Generations just preceding ours were able simply to presume that the quest and mission entrusted to higher education would be carried out by the institution that purported to continue that heritage. Many of these individuals were leaders and shapers of higher education, and their speeches continued to speak in this way. It was only when a series of setbacks conspired to face higher education with some "hard decisions" that their rhetoric gave way to the practical policies of professional managers. Then we could see that there is no inherent connection between the goals and policies of higher education and a quest for truth. Priorities are revealed in a time of shrinking budgets and accelerating costs. It is not self-evident that the pursuit of truth remains a top priority in such a time, nor is it a simple matter to assure that it does.

So whoever wishes to continue to describe their participation in higher education as a quest for truth must look elsewhere than within education itself to forge that crucial connection. What is needed is an institution that celebrates the spontaneous orientation of mind and heart to what is true, and that also exercises individual hearts and minds in the disciplines needed to carry out that orientation. The only institution we know like that is the church, and as we know it, it seldom performs these offices gracefully or effectively. So we must appeal to

the church that would be; we must challenge the church to be what it can be.

Indeed, this may be the final reason why the church is engaged in education. The alluring goals which we set for education are encouraged by our religious traditions, and the goals in turn challenge those traditions to live up to what they profess. If higher education needs the context of the church to provide the setting and the incentive for the quest for truth, the church needs higher education as well. The church needs the expertise which the educational institution represents. It needs the kind of self-criticism which characterizes the academic enterprise at its best, and it needs the developing human potential which is being shaped by educational programs and communities. We may well think of the church-related college or university as the place where the church goes to school. We need to find ways to bring that description to life, it is true, but a mutual relationship of this sort is bound to be fruitful though it may not always be harmonious.

Ways that Colleges Reflect the Church Connection

Churches are engaged in higher education, then, for their own sakes as well as to offer the higher context which higher education needs to carry out its traditional mission. For their own sake they cannot afford not to be. But what are church-related colleges and universities actually doing to display their connection with church and even to capitalize on it? It is immensely difficult even to begin to answer this question, for the more one is involved in such an institution, the more aware he or she becomes of the gap between promise and practice. The very promise held out for educating minds and hearts in an arduous quest for truth breeds an opposite despair and cynicism on the part of faculty and students who fail to notice much difference in their schools. Yet their perception is invariably offset by the perspective of outsiders, who usually notice a great deal of difference.

International Action in Service of Truth

It seems appropriate to ask that there be differences, but it is distracting to try to indicate what they ought to be. There is no single feature that can pick out a church-related college or university, and if any individual or group – including the sponsoring church – would try to set one, they have missed the point of the relationship. It is a fruitful one precisely when the church provides the context within which it makes sense to speak of searching after truth, and the educational in-

stitution continues to demand just that of the church. This context will involve liturgical celebration and explicitly foster those disciplines of mind and heart which can cultivate devotion. It will also involve programs of service designed to develop a better working grasp of the implications of Christian faith in today's world.[2] In fact, a church-related college or university will find itself unable to rest with theoretical understanding alone. The concern of faculty and students will instinctively call for testing conventional wisdom against actual practice. Moreover, since that concern will be expressed in terms congruent with the stated commitment of the institution, it should receive a hearing. If such a demand is in fact heard, what could result would be a far more critical grasp of issues than a purely theoretical treatment could ever accomplish. The web of interrelations between theory and practice would be exposed and would become part of the education one could expect from a church-related college or university.

The actual strategies employed will be many and will vary from one tradition to another. For the most part, they will not be overtly religious. They may involve training periods overseas to capture a vision of human development wider than current American society has to offer, or a series of electives placing a student's major sequence or career studies in a larger philosophical or theological perspective. A visitor may note a peculiar penchant for interdisciplinary or team-taught courses, where individuals collaborate to reach out beyond the settled borders of their disciplines, groping for the point of their professional research. That very research may find itself invited to clarify particular areas of church life, or it may be brought to bear on critical points where church and society interact. The context may supply material as much as it will offer directions for actual inquiry. Christian higher education takes heart from Paul's description of Jesus as Lord: "the one in whom and through whom and for whom all things are created, and who holds all things together" (Col. 1:16-17). We are invited and encouraged to try to envision what we are doing as whole-cloth, and not simply piece-work, and its design should somehow reflect him whom the church confesses as the Lord of life.

Features like these could characterize any educational endeavor, and sometimes they do. Yet they seem to find a more welcome reception in a church-related college or university, or they ought to, and not simply because such a place can say that its programs aim after truth but because these institutions can count on engaging faculty and receiving students who have attained some capacity for bearing that truth. These institutions count on the church especially for having formed

young men and women who are not afraid to seek, and churches count on the institutions to foster that fearlessness and equip it with the skills needed to carry on the work.

Many of these skills will be overtly professional. Although traditionally associated with the liberal arts, church-related higher education in the United States has always occupied itself with professional training as well. Equipping students to play responsible roles in our society has been a consistent aim of these institutions. Their actual practice in this regard might help to mediate the current debate between liberal and professional education. Where service and knowledge are both avowed goals, a faculty can be freed to appreciate how liberal studies may be utilized in planning curricula designed to develop critical professionals. By bringing theoretical considerations up against current practice, in a disciplined fashion, professional and liberal models of education can enrich one another. Again, the context which the church provides should facilitate that exchange.

Demand for Faculty Development

It is here, perhaps, where church-related colleges and universities most clearly fail – in challenging faculty and students to build on an earlier formation a structure of personal character and competence which will enable them to meet the pressing needs of our time. They are rather too easily content with a complacent sense of their *difference* from the church out of which they come and too impressed with the mandate to equip their students to get ahead. Furthermore, our institutions want to "get ahead" as well, and they may too readily let go their distinctive vision if this seems to improve their chances to move forward. With neither the courage of our convictions nor sufficient insight into them, we can easily fail to become the leaven we believe ourselves to be and settle for a merely denominational identity, or we may simply mirror the surrounding "national culture."[3]

This danger is particularly acute when we fail to provide clear directions for faculty in this regard. Standard criteria for academic advancement have little to do with the perspectives outlined above. Thus, church-related colleges must not only take special care to specify their expectations; they must also provide programs to assist faculty to develop the sorts of skills which will allow them to participate in so distinctive an educational goal. Graduate schools do not normally prepare one for so demanding a task, and individual charisma is too unstable to be counted upon. An institution which claims to be distinctive will actually become so only when it offers explicit assistance to faculty to ex-

plore ways of translating that vision into their teaching, scholarship, and service.

Conclusion

One of the advantages of our times is that institutions which settle for less may well not last, for the last remaining sense to the much-abused expression "secularization" seems to be that churches are notably less successful in directly influencing the activity of their members.[4] Thus, Presbyterians can no longer be counted on to send their children to Presbyterian colleges simply because these schools are said to be "Presbyterian." Something distinctive must be happening there for them to do so, and if it is, others will be drawn to attend as well. Therefore, the issue of "church support" – support, that is, from the churches for the colleges and by the colleges of the churches – can no longer be discussed in flat denominational terms but must clearly be reflected in our purpose. Students are entitled to ask: *How* does this college or university show us ways to become yet more what the church envisions as the purpose of life? What can be seen in its programs and in its lived atmosphere which opens us to a more articulate vision and encourages us to walk with firmer conviction along paths inspired by the history of Christian service? How are faculty and administration mutually involved in exploring these regions? How are students being emboldened to move beyond the narrow perspectives of our surrounding culture to conceive for themsleves a radical vision of life akin to the Gospel? How are we attempting to equip them to implement such a vision? These are the sort of questions which a self-examination of church-related education invites.

SOURCES

[1]Robert Rue Parsonage, ed., *Church-Related Higher Education* (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Judson Press, 1978), Chapter 2. For a perceptive discussion of goals and issues, see Edgar M. Carlson, *The Future of Church-Related Higher Education* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1977).

[2]For a judicious discussion of these questions, see Julian N. Hartt, *Theology and the Church in the University* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969).

[3]Cf. Michael Novak, "The One and the Many," *Daedelus*, 103 (1974), pp. 203-11.

[4]See John Coleman's clarifying discussion of the slippery notion of *secularization*: "Situation for Modern Faith," *Theological Studies* 39 (1978), pp. 601-32.

Chapter 3

CHURCH-RELATED HIGHER EDUCATION: DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS

Harry E. Smith

The perennial effort to describe the *uniqueness* of church-related colleges and universities has often preoccupied denominational officials and conferences discussing the contribution of these institutions to American higher education. But not only is the search for uniqueness like "pursuing a will o' the wisp and questionable on educational grounds," [1] it is seldom taken seriously by the very persons it is supposed to impress. What is "unique" to an institution should not be available elsewhere, and Christians should be aware of the power of God to work through non-Christians and public institutions alike. Christian professors and administrators in public institutions are quick to point out evidences of these same characteristics in their own experience and institutions.

Perhaps a more productive and less self-deceiving or self-justifying approach to clarifying the distinctive contribution which church-related institutions – at their best – make to American higher education is to ask what difference their affiliation and identification with a church make in the total educational experience they offer. Such an approach avoids odious comparisons which claim that the graduates of church-related colleges and universities are better educated, more deeply committed Christians, or more sensitive human beings than the graduates of other institutions. It also focuses upon the characteristics of such institutions which are the actual results of their church-relatedness. Admittedly, some of these characteristics can be found in other independent and even public institutions, but they are not so self-consciously cultivated and acknowledged as in church-related institutions.

1. Sense of Educational Mission and Defined Goals

In the midst of great confusion about educational purpose and programs – between and even within most institutions of postsecondary education – most church-related colleges have a clear sense of mission, a set of goals which gives coherence and purpose to their faculty, staff, and students. Whether these are the promises of college catalogues, trustee statements, or promotional brochures, they give evidence that some-

one has set down why the institution exists and how it understands itself. Although these defined goals may not be shared by all faculty, students, or administrators, there is widespread recognition that they are there to give direction and purpose to the college, to shape the curriculum and campus ethos, and to be taken seriously by those considering enter the community, whether as faculty or students. In this sense, faculty considering employment and students enrolling in a church-related college or university need to be made aware of how the institution understands itself and the concomitant demands which this places upon them as participants in the particular academic community –an awareness scarcely expected in a state university or community college where there is no consensus concerning such goals. It is appropriate to explore with prospective faculty how their commitments and goals accord with those of the institution in order to insure sympathy if not support of the college's sense of educational mission.

These goals may take different forms – depending upon the institution, the philosophy of education of the denomination to which it is related, and the leadership of the college at a particular time. Nevertheless, the goals are there for all to see, and they provide a constant standard for assessing how effectively the college is living up to the aims it has set for itself.

St. Olaf College, in connection with its centennial, engaged in a careful reappraisal of its mission, producing not only a new statement of purpose but an extensive value-orientated curriculum reform.

Wittenberg University's Commission on Mission and Priorities has recently completed its work, identifying seven priorities for the institution and making specific recommendations as to how its explicit values can be better manifested in academic, personal, and social pursuits.[2]

2. Desired Outcomes in the Lives of Students

Although there will be differences in descriptions of the ideal graduate of any college among faculty and administrators, there should be some general consensus about what outcomes are expected. Often characterized as "the education of whole persons," or education in which "students learn how to think critically, communicate clearly, feel deeply, and act responsibly," the desired outcomes of church-related higher education always include more than cognitive learning and technical competence, and they contain references to a sense of personal meaning and social purpose. Because of the importance of attaining

these outcomes, there is usually a broader acceptance of developmental approaches to cognitive and moral learning, greater concern for the living environment as an integral part of the educational experience, efforts to provide some coherence through the core curriculum and interdisciplinary courses, and programs to develop independent study and group research skills.

Such a holistic approach to learning also involves an appropriate tension between liberal learning and professional training. Although there is a strong temptation today – in response to the narrow vocational interests of many students – to downgrade those aspects of an education which encourage the development of imagination and judgment and an appreciation for our Western intellectual heritage, commitment to learning for its own sake and the conviction that education must be grounded in the humanities should keep any church-related college constantly seeking to redress the imbalance between liberal learning and technical training which is so predominant today. This means guarding against adding vocational programs and trying to be all things to all students, and having limited, clearly defined goals in order to provide the kind of liberal education which enables students to be fully human whatever their profession may be.

Alverno College has developed an outcome-oriented curriculum which focuses upon eight abilities toward which all teaching is oriented. *Mars Hill College* has spent the last decade developing and revising its outcome-oriented curriculum. And *St. Joseph's College* in Rensselaer, Indiana, has modified Eckerd College's integrative approach to general education in its Core Program, which includes a six-credit interdisciplinary course in all but the last semester of a four-year program.[3]

3. Value-Oriented Education

Closely related to these first two goals is the development of an educational environment and experience which unapologetically encourage and nurture the development of personal values in all students. Although few church-related colleges would admit to providing a value-free education, there have not been sufficient systematic efforts to expose and explore the value dimension of all disciplines, to encourage faculty to articulate their own value assumptions, and to make explicit the implicit values in the way institutions treat students, employ faculty, or govern themselves. Choices in values and beliefs must first be clarified and students helped to develop the capacity to make and defend value choices derived from their own faith perspectives. Faculty

must be encouraged to explore the value assumptions in their profession, disciplines, and teaching styles, and administrators must be enabled to articulate the values implicit in the way institutional priorities are established, personnel policies are made, and budgets are developed and administered.

Sienna Heights College has initiated a developmental approach to values education through its Values Sequence in the Religious Studies Department,[4] and *Alverno College* considers "Valuing in decision-making" one of the eight objectives which is "integrated with the content and methodology of most academic disciplines without doing violence to the discipline."[5] *St. Louis University's* project on "Career-Oriented Value Education" helps undergraduates to confront values and career issues and includes internships in the community.[6]

4. Institutional Integrity

Since students learn outside the classroom as well as within it, institutions are becoming increasingly aware of what they communicate – and therefore teach – by the environment they provide, the congruence between what is taught in the classroom and practiced in institutional policy. It is hard for a college to teach convincingly the equal worth of all persons if there are no minorities and few women represented in the administration or faculty: or to teach social justice in the classroom and still support unjust, repressive governments in other countries through its investments or research contracts; or to develop humane values when it treats students as objects, employees as machines, or gives no attention to the special needs of the physically handicapped.

> Students will be strongly influenced – educated – by the attitude of faculty toward them and their freedom, by the existence and observance of policies and procedures which touch on the rights of individuals, by the governance of the college as they both perceive and experience it. You cannot educate to a democratic ethos in an autocratic institution; you cannot develop individual responsibility in a school where none is allowed; you cannot teach a philosophy of collegiality in a highly centralized governing structure.[7]

St. Norbert College, De Pere, Wisconsin, used the Institutional Goals Inventory from Educational Testing Service and the Delphi technique to develop a goals and objectives statement reflecting a total community consensus. These goals provide a standard for review of all college

decisions and policies.[8] St. Norbert's Education-by-Objectives program is based upon the assumption that students will be "more highly motivated if their goals and values, the means for identifying and pursuing them, and their relationship to the college experience are clear and unequivocal."[9]

5. Opportunities for Religious Growth

Important in any church-related college will be its provision for spiritual development. This includes an organized campus religious program and college chaplaincy, a strong department of religion where the study of religion is taken seriously, the deliberate cultivation of religious sensitivity throughout the curriculum, and an openness to exploring the religious dimension in all disciplines. It also involves attention to the particular religious tradition to which the college is related and an awareness of the various options which are available to persons interested in church vocations.

The relationship between a college and the institutional church will take many and varied forms, from casual contacts to significant covenants to formal legal ties, but the relationship should be by conscious choice, intentional, not just happenstance or an historical legacy, and should have clear implications for how the college functions vis-a-vis the church.

Whitworth College not only has a strong religion department but a chaplaincy staff of seven full-time employees for a student body of approximately 1,200, and has developed a variety of ways faculty and chaplains can stimulate the imaginations of local church leaders and serve as a resource to the churches.[10] *Austin College* was one of the first institutions to develop a covenant relationship to the Presbyterian Church and has periodically reviewed and revised its covenant with the Synod of Red River.[11]

6. Sense of Community

Another characteristic of church-related institutions is the experience of community which they offer. Although some consider this a natural result of their small size – compared to the massive state universities – it is more accurately perceived as a by-product of the shared goals, value-orientation, institutional integrity, and occasions for worship and celebration noted above.

The development of responsible persons requires a supportive com-

munity in which individual freedom and community expectations are kept in healthy tension. Hence, most church-related colleges and universities articulate clearly what is expected of students as members of their academic community, take seriously an Honor System, and provide procedures for protecting students from the inconsiderate behavior of other students in residence halls and social life. "Intimations of wholeness" are also evident in campus convocations, bacculaureate services, and the cultic events whereby the common commitments of the college are recognized.

For some colleges, this means selecting a theme for the year, for example, "Individual Development" at *Whitworth College*, "Improving the Environment: Individual and Community Responsibility" at *Austin College*, and an annual "Reflections and Hope" symposium for seniors at *Simpson College*. For other institutions this means an annual Religion Emphasis Week or issue-oriented symposia, such as *Duke University's* recent symposium on the Holocaust.

7. Freedom and Courage to Innovate

Although the current shortage of funds and preoccupation with survival have discouraged many innovative efforts, the freedom for experimentation, the possibility for innovation, remains a potentially distinctive feature of church-related colleges. Such institutions can more readily develop new programs, selectively recruit students interested in special programs, and attract supporters who endorse what they are doing than most public institutions can. Because of the smaller scale, diminished risks, and freedom from having to be everything to everybody, such institutions have substantially more opportunity to experiment, revise calendars, alter course requirements, offer independent and experiential study programs, and develop overseas study experiences.

Too often in the past church-related colleges have abdicated this freedom, falling into the lockstep with other institutions, thus diminishing the richness and diversity of American higher education. At their best, however, the colleges of the church enjoy and utilize an atmosphere of innovation which encourages faculty to develop new courses, try new teaching methods, experiment with interdisciplinary and team teaching, and develop new programs.

Eckerd College's pioneering work developing January term options and collaboration, *Kalamazoo College's* required programs off-campus and abroad, *Manchester College's* Peace Studies programs, and *Goshen College's* satellite campuses beside large public universities – all are

examples of programs initiated by colleges which are exploring ways to improve the learning options.

Obviously, no church-related college or university perfectly embodies these distinguishing characteristics. Yet the institutions' conscious affiliation with the church makes these characteristics not only possible but important as they seek to provide a distinctive living/learning environment grounded in the conviction that "in Him all things hold together" and are made whole.

SOURCES

[1]Charles S. McCoy, "The Church-Related College in American Society," in *The Contribution of the Church-Related College to the Public Good* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1970), p. 50.

[2]Robert R. Parsonage, ed., *Church-Related Higher Education* (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Judson Press, 1978), p. 129.

[3]Michael Donnellson and James Ebben, eds., *Values Pedagogy in Higher Education* (Adrian, Michigan: Sienna Heights College, 1978), p. 78.

[4]*Ibid.*, pp. 143ff.

[5]*Ibid.*, pp. 49ff.

[6]*Ibid.*, pp. 173ff.

[7]William Sullivan, S. J., "Theses Disputandae on the Moral Purposes of Higher Education," *NICM Journal*, 3 (Summer, 1978), p. 17.

[8]*Ibid.*, pp. 62-63.

[9]*Ibid.*, p. 59.

[10]*Parsonage, op cit.*, p. 66.

[11]*Ibid.*, p. 117.

Chapter 4

CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: IDENTITY AND INTEGRITY

Edgar M. Carlson

What follows is an attempt to set forth considerations which need to be taken into account by church-related colleges and universities which intend to function with integrity as educational institutions and as institutions related to a church or other recognized religious community. This will be done in the form of three groups of affirmations: (1) those that relate to integrity as an educational institution, (2) those that relate to the educational focus of the kind of institution that is seriously concerned with its church-relatedness, and (3) those that deal with specific policy implications of church-relatedness for educational institutions.

Affirmations that Relate to Integrity as an Educational Institution

1. *We affirm that education in general, and higher education in particular, must be viewed as having its own inherent nature, function, and purpose.*

It is self-evident that an educational institution cannot be a good church-related college or university without first being a good college or university. Whether an institution is a good college or university must be judged by how well it performs its own inherent function and purpose. We affirm the usefulness of education in helping to equip persons for their roles in the economy, as citizens and as participants in culture generally, but we do not believe that such training constitutes the primary function of education. We reject an understanding of education which would treat it solely or even primarily as an instrument by which other social needs can be met. We cannot accept the assumption that the nature and extent of higher education should be governed by available spaces in the job market or by the need for various kinds of services in our society. To deny to persons with the potential for personal development through higher education the opportunity for such development simply because society is unable to provide employment calling for that level of education cannot be justified.

2. *We affirm that the distinctive and basic function of higher education is the pursuit and dissemination of truth in all its forms and the development in the student of the capacity to discern and use it.*

The question of truth must be the central concern of higher education. While other social structures and agencies are interested in truth as it relates to their own activities, educational institutions may properly be said to be concerned about truth for its own sake. This includes concern for the nature of truth, its varied definitions and interpretations. Teachers and institutions may have a very limited definition of what truth is – for instances, factual data or technical process – and this will be reflected in their understanding of educational goals and processes. But whether broad or narrow, shallow or profound, the definitions of truth espoused by an institution must be its reason for existence and the governing principle of its operation. This is true whether one looks at education as the preserver and transmitter of cultural insight and experience or as the explorer of new realms and creator of the culture of the future.

3. *We believe that church-related colleges and universities must accept and affirm all valid standards and criteria applicable to the educational enterprise anywhere.*

If any kind of educational institution should feel a high sense of calling to the academic life and pursuit and dissemination of truth, it should be the church-related institution. We note in another paper the link between the mind's search for God and the mind's search for truth as evidenced by the original link between education and medieval religious communities. We have argued also that the context for the church's faith provides education with its needed foundation and incentive for a genuine quest for truth. There are those who would wish to make the link between the college and the church closer than that, confident that no tension need exist between the mission of education and the mission of the church.

We must, however, realistically acknowledge that there is uneasiness at this point among many of the faculty members of church-related institutions. There does appear to be a tension between the faith commitment and general criteria of academic freedom and excellence. There are even greater reservations in the general academic community as to whether the definitions of freedom and responsibility, and the standards and criteria of performance recognized in the general educational enterprise, can be held to apply equally on the church-related campus. We shall deal with this more fully at a later point.

Affirmations that Relate to the Educational Focus for the Kind of Institution that is Seriously Concerned with its Church-Relatedness

1. *We believe that no college or university can be church-related in any significant sense unless it desires and intends to be such an institution.*

We must assume a genuine inclination on the part of the institution to make the actual or hypothetical church-relatedness productive in the life and program of the institution. Otherwise, any discussion of what this implies is meaningless.

Every institution with a sense of direction must intend to be something – it must have an intentional identity. Unless it does, it will be governed by inertia or chance pressures and impulses. Policies and programs should be derived from an integrated purpose, governed by what the institution intends to be. Although this is true of all institutions, it is especially true that no college or university becomes permeated with whatever it is that church-relatedness provides without intending that it should happen.

2. *We believe that, to be effective, educational institutions of the sort which most church-related colleges aspire to be must design patterns of educational experience directed toward the achievement of identifiable outcomes involving knowledge, values, commitments, and general personal growth.*

Although church-related universities have more comprehensive goals and more varied programs, to the extent that they embrace general liberal arts components and purposes along with professional competence, they too need to include concern for personal fulfillment and social adequacy, as well as academic excellence, among the outcomes they seek.

The point here being made is that we cannot expect to achieve identifiable outcomes consistent with our institutional purposes if what the student takes is the product of chance or personal inclination at any given moment. We have been in danger of developing what someone has called "the Green Stamp University"[1] where each student gets a book of blank squares which can be filled by any number of stamps representing courses taken, each of which is as relevant and appropriate as any other. The shift away from such unstructured educational options, however, in recent years is an encouraging development. We believe that church-related institutions need to have some pattern in the educational experiences afforded students if they are to

be responsible in the exercise of their educational function. If we are merely disseminating information that we have acquired, the approach of taking what you want, where you want to, and when you want to, may work, but if we are seeking to develop students in terms of understanding, professional competence, personal growth, and social adequacy, we must design programs that are calculated to achieve those ends.

3. *We believe that church-related colleges and universities need to develop the ability to teach values, both in the sense of identifying authentic values and value systems and in the sense of demonstrating and encouraging commitment to them.*

The greatest deficiencies in education today are related to the inability or the unwillingness to teach values. The working assumption of the academic community seems to have been that objectivity with regard to facts mandated neutrality with regard to values. There is currently a widespread dissatisfaction with the failure of schools at all levels to assist in the development of attitudes and outlooks informed by authentic and workable patterns of social and moral values. There are repeated requests from students of law and business for more study and discussion of ethical issues as they relate to their professions. At the same time there is considerable reluctance on the part of the educational community to accept responsibility in this area. This reluctance rests in part on the pluralism of moral and ethical views and the desire to avoid partisanship in moral and religious matters. In part, it reflects the general uncertainty as to how such values are taught and a question as to whether education that seeks to serve a wide range of the general population can or should deal with matters on which there is no general agreement. There is a temptation to take refuge in some technique, such as the popular "values-clarification" process, or to substitute for general values and commitments the "values of education" or "educational values" as a suitable expression of value concerns in the field of education.[2]

Persons involved in the academic world will not need to be persuaded of the values of science, scholarship, reverence for truth, and the disciplines that these bring with them, but both individuals and societies need values beyond these if they are to be adequate to the demands which contemporary existence imposes opon them. Reverence for life is not less important than reverence for truth. Social justice does not flow by any inherent necessity from sound scholarship. Even simple honesty and kindness are not so conjoined with academic ability or achievement

that they can be assumed to be by-products of any good educational process.

Whether education as presently constituted and pursued is capable of meeting the needs of modern society at this point remains to be seen. Such evidence as there is suggests that institutions with a strong sense of institutional purpose, and which consciously undertake to give serious attention and effort to the needs of the whole person, are more likely to be successful in this respect. Some of the significant programs in church-related colleges dealing with value education are referred to in the paper dealing with "Distinguishing Characteristics."

We believe that as institutions seek to establish their identity and decide what kind of institutions they intend to be and what their intended outcomes are, they will want to give increasing attention to the whole matter of value patterns. As they do, they will become conscious of the need for some sort of normative image of the human and some sort of ideal for society to which the individual could or should be committed. When questions of this sort are raised seriously, the educational institution becomes aware of its own dependence on views of life and the world which are larger than the campus or the educational enterprise as an academic activity. These are areas in which religious attitudes and commitments become highly relevant. We in church-related institutions need to examine carefully and with integrity the relation of Christian faith to both personal and institutional values.

4. *We believe that in its church-relatedness a college or university has its most important tie with the cultural diversity which characterizes this nation, and that it also has a natural source of insight and an effective ally in seeking to develop and sustain significant value patterns and commitments.*

The tendency toward conformity among educational institutions in recent decades has been marked, and widely deplored. Frank Newman, in his 1971 *Report on Higher Education* for HEW, said, ". . . our colleges and universities have become extraordinarily similar . . . The traditional sources of differentiation – between public and private, large and small, secular and sectarian, male and female – are disappearing. Even the differences in character of individual institutions are fading."[3] W. B. Martin summarized his findings from the "Institutional Character Research Project" in his 1969 volume *Conformity: Standard and Change in Higher Education*: "American higher education has been characterized (in this study) by conformity where diversity is needed, that is, at the level of values."[4] Another writer, in a similar vein, concludes, "We

need to re-evaluate all of the goals and benefits of different institutions and programs and try to reverse the trend toward homogeneity that has marked our system of higher education during the last decades . . ."[5]

If we are to recover and retain instititional distinctiveness, we need to revitalize our ties with institutions and constituencies that embody the diversity which is to be found in our American culture. It is an undeniable fact that institutional distinctiveness is generated by cultural diversity in the larger community more than it is by creativity or rigor in the academic community itself. The academic enterprise by itself tends toward uniformity in goals, methods, and outcomes. The cultural diversity which is characteristic of American society is directly related to the cultural traditions which reflect the diversity of our origins. Religion was an integral and effective element in those traditions.

We believe that the church-related college or university has a natural tie with this cultural diversity through the church and that this association offers a contact and a context for the development of distinctive and enriching characteristics.

In utilizing this resource, church-related colleges and universities will be acting in conformity with well-established educational practice. The way in which educational programs have learned to relate to larger communities is one of the most important trends in education in recent years. Internships, off-campus study, and practicums of various kinds have become commonplace. Although many of these are vocationally oriented, this is not true of all of them. There is a natural and supportive tie between fine arts colleges and departments with art museums and institutes which goes well beyond the prospects for employment and which recognizes shared interests and possibilities. If the college or university wishes to be church-related and takes seriously its responsibility for the development of sound values, goals, and commitments on the part of its students, and if these parallel in important ways the concerns of the church, ought not such a college or university be as concerned to develop supportive relations for those aspects of its mission as it is in the case of academic goals or direct vocational objectives? Departments of religious studies at some public institutions are seeking to develop the sort of relations with churches which church-related institutions already have in order that they might find attitudinal support for their departmental objectives.

This does not mean that the college or university is expected to reflect uncritically the value systems of churches and their members. The most dynamic and productive relationship is likely to be one in which a certain "faith-learning tension" exists. The church needs to

confront the college or university with the question: What do you believe? The question is important for both individuals and institutions. Institutions in the pursuit of their academic objectives must ask: How do you know? Why do you believe? It has been properly observed that the faith-learning tension can be expected to be more severe on the church-related college or university campus just because it takes seriously both its academic mission and the statements in which the church expresses its beliefs.[6]

Affirmations That Deal With Specific Policy Inplications of Church-Relatedness for Educational Institutions

1. *We believe that the church-related college or university, if it is to possess integrity, should be able to affirm moral and spiritual postures which are compatible with those of the church to which it professes to be related, and that it should cultivate an image of itself which incorporates that which makes it distinctive as well as that which identifies it with other institutions of learning.*

The college or university which wishes to be positively related to the church should have more than a curiosity about moral and religious values and commitments. It should be the arena in which ideas about not only religion and morality but also religious and moral commitments are at home. Certainly this does not prescribe uniformity and rigidity in attitude and outlook. Such an institution may very properly reflect on its faculty and in its program the diversity which is to be found in the publics which it serves.

At the very least, such a posture as we have indicated calls for an academic program in which opportunities are present for serious consideration of religious issues and for voluntary participation in religious activities and practices. It should be possible to pursue religious subject matter in breadth and depth paralleling that of any other field. Religious and moral considerations should be legitimate in any course in which they are relevant. One of the purposes of this kind of institution should be the development in the student of a comprehensive and integrated world-view, reflecting fundamental assumptions and outlook.

It is important, however, to draw a distinction between the college or university and the church. By using the term "compatible," we have intended to recognize that each has a distinctive function. But these supplement rather than contradict one another. The difference may be illustrated by the difference between a protestation of love and an analysis – psychological, sociological, or semantic – of what that pro-

testation in fact means or conveys. An analysis which would explain away the affirmation of love as an illusion would not be compatible with it. The church-related college or university may properly examine the church's affirmations from all relevant points of view and perhaps propose that they need to be revised, but it should not analyze and interpret them in ways which nullify the affirmations which they contain. That would not be compatible with the faith which is inherent in the life of the church.

It may also be useful to draw a distinction between ultimate and proximate ends. The former normally refer to persons more than to institutions. Thus, personal fulfillment, reverence for life, glorifying God, and service to humanity may be considered to be proper ultimate goals by which persons should be governed. They involve personal decisions and commitments which cannot be made by others for them. The role of institutions with reference to ultimate goals is to examine and appraise them for the benefit of those who hold them. In this secondary sense an institution becomes involved with the ultimate goals of individuals. But it is more properly and concretely concerned with proximate goals: for example, helping students to serve humanity by helping them to understand themselves and others, by helping them to develop competencies which are useful to society, and by assisting them to develop attitudes which will encourage them to use their capacities toward those ends. The means which the student learns to use should be suited to the ends which are affirmed by the college and the constituency which in some measure it represents. One would not expect, for instance, colleges that are related to "peace churches" to develop military academies. Similarly, a nihilistic view of life in the classroom would not be compatible with the life-affirming stance of the Christian church. A completely cynical view of life in the classroom would not be compatible with a church that affirms meaning and purpose in the historical process.

Up to this point we have spoken primarily of the church-related college or university in terms of its instructional function. Virtually all educational institutions recognize some activity identified as research and a more or less comprehensive service role. Each of these offers significant opportunity for mutually supportive activities. Educational institutions constitute a great resource for the church in terms of competent research personnel, and the church might well encourage their research activities in areas of particular concern to the church. There is no reason why the educational institution related to a church should not discharge a substantial part of its service function in relation to the

church constituency. It might well be argued that the relationship between the church-related institution and the church organization, at this point, parallels the relationship between the public institution and its public constituencies.

2. *We believe that the church-related college or university which aims to implement its more comprehensive and distinctive goals must engage and retain staff members who can reasonably be expected to assist in achieving them.*

The achievement of educational objectives, those that are distinctive no less than those that are common to all educational institutions, rests with teaching faculty and staff. Unless they believe the objectives are important and share, at least to some degree, the commitment which the institution makes, there is no possibility that the objectives will be achieved.

This obviously involves very sensitive questions regarding what kinds of qualifications can appropriately be sought. Clearly there must be scrupulous regard for the inherent nature of the academic enterprise (as identified in the first three affirmations in this paper) and careful adherence to all processes established to safeguard it, but this cannot mean that purely academic considerations stand alone. A liberal arts college, for instance, cannot assume that academic performance in graduate studies will ensure commitment to the holistic development of students to which it is committed. The Gross-Grambsch studies, among others, have demonstrated the wide disparity between both the "perceived" and "preferred" goals of graduate faculties and liberal arts colleges.[7] The liberal arts college must seek a staff congenial with and supportive of its liberal arts objectives. If we have been justified in asserting the role of values, goals, and commitments for all education, and the validity of distinctive values, goals, and commitments for the church-related college or university, it seems equally evident that these institutions need to take them into account in seeking faculty to implement their goals. There is no reason to suppose that a faculty supportive of them would be acquired accidentally, as a by-product of sheer academic competence.

This goal is not achieved by pre-determined denominational affiliation for all or a designated portion of faculty. What is important is not that the church-related institution have a faculty of a given denominational affiliation, but that it have a faculty which is in accord with its goals and objectives and which is prepared to assist in achieving them. Institutional goals and purposes should be defined with sufficient

concreteness so that they may be used as guides for the selection of faculty and staff.

Legal implications of church-relatedness is the province of another Study Commission of the National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities but the area which we are now discussing is clearly one that is fraught with legal implications. A cursory review of the excellent study *Colleges and Sponsoring Religious Bodies*, published by the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities in conjunction with the Center for Constitutional Studies, University of Notre Dame, suggests that the position here taken is not in conflict with court decisions. The crucial issue is whether courses are taught "according to the academic requirements intrinisic to the subject matter and the individual teacher's concept of professional standards" and whether there is reliable evidence that schools are "characterized by an atmosphere of academic freedom rather than religious indoctriniations."[8]

We have earlier acknowledge that there is uneasiness among members of the academic community, including those within church-related colleges, with respect to possible infringements of academic freedom and sound academic practice as a result of institutional commitments, especially when these are associated with religious faith. It seems proper, and even important, that church-related institutions and their governing boards formally and officially affirm their commitment to the sound academic standards and procedures identified by the Court in order that conscientious faculty members may be supported in the pursuit of their academic goals.

Institutions may properly ask what the position here taken means concretely with regard to the selection of faculty and staff. At the very least it means that a prospective faculty or staff member should be willing to work within the institutional commitment and be able to do so without loss of integrity. It cannot be an obligation of institutions to employ people to oppose their purposes or goals. At times and in some areas, in order to have academic competence, we may have to settle for no more than an attitude of neutrality and consent with regard to distinctive institutional goals, but we have no reason to believe that we will achieve any value goals with a whole faculty committed to neutrality with regard to values any more than we would expect to achieve academic goals with a faculty committed to neutrality with regard to academic goals. Goals are not achieved by non-contributors. If we do engage persons purely for their academic contribution, we should not fault them because they have not contributed as we would have wished in terms of the larger institutional objectives.

There remains, of course, the knotty question of what does an institution do when it has made a mistake and finds itself with faculty and staff members who are not sympathetic to the goals and objectives of the institution, especially those goals and objectives that relate to its church-relatedness. On this issue we make three observations.

First, there is the largest amount of freedom in the initial engagement of faculty and staff; therefore, this is the point at which greatest care should be exercised with respect to total institutional purposes and comprehensive qualifications.

Second, if distinctive institutional purposes and goals are valid considerations at initial engagement, they are also valid at the point of permanent engagement, or tenure. There is, however, relatively less freedom to exclude, and greater consideration must be shown for commitments made or implied as well as for proper procedures being employed.

Third, where persons out of sympathy with distinctive educational goals have become tenured, the institution would appear to be in the same situation as with respect to general educational goals. Except where conduct is such as to warrant separation under general educational standards and procedures, the institution will rely on the positive impact of the total institution to offset any negative influence. Institutional longevity normally renews the opportunity for careful selection.

SOURCES

[1]Gordon C. Craig, "Green Stamp or Structured Undergraduate Education?" *Daedalus* (Fall, 1974), p. 144.

[2]Cf. W. Allen Wallis, "Unity in Diversity," *Daedalus* (Winter, 1975), p. 70, and Derek Bok, "On the Purposes of Undergraduate Education," *Daedalus* (Fall, 1974), p. 161. For a more positive view, see Dana L. Farnsworth's article in the same volume on "Social Values in College and University."

[3]F. Newman, Chairman. *Report on Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971).

[4]W. B. Martin, *Conformity: Standards and Change in Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969), pp. 210-211.

[5]Oscar T. Lenning, *The "Benefits Crisis" in Higher Education, ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 1 1974* (Washington, D.C.: The American Association for Higher Education), p. 4.

[6]For a very good discussion of the "faith-learning tension" as it relates to church-related institutions, see Alburey Castell, "The College and the Church-Related College," in *The Church-Related College Today: Anachronism or Opportunity?* (Nashville: General Board of Education, United Methodist Church, 1971), p. 62.

[7]It would be possible to document this from a number of sources, but the study done by E. Gross and P. V. Grambsch for the American Council on Education, published under the title *University Goals and Academic Power* (Washington, D.C.: ACE, 1968), may be the

most impressive.

[8]Philip R. Moots and Edward McGlynn Gaffney, *Colleges and Sponsoring Religious Bodies: A Study of Policy Influence and Property Relationships* (Washington: Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities and the Center for Constitutional Studies, 1978).

SECTION III
Issues of Society

Chapter 5

WHY SHOULD CHURCH-RELATED HIGHER EDUCATION ADDRESS ITSELF TO SOCIAL ISSUES?

Richard P. McBrien

The thesis of this paper is straightforward enough: Church-related higher education should address itself to social issues precisely because (a) such colleges and universities are church-related, and (b) social issues fall within the essential mission of the church.

It is *not* the concern of this paper to suggest the *form* of that involvement (the question raised in J. R. Fulcher's and Edward Wright's contributions) nor its *academic implications* (the question raised in Merle Longwood's and William Nelsen's papers.) I have prepared a paper consistent not only with my specific assignment but also with my particular competence as a theologian.

Determining Church-Relatedness

How do we know, first, whether or not a college or university is church-related? Is it sufficient for the institution simply to say that it is? I shall not enter the legal arguments here, but with the growth of such organizations as the Unification Church the question has become a matter of major practical interest for the Internal Revenue Service. I should argue instead that a college or university is genuinely church-related when it meets certain theological criteria.

First, its stated *purpose and goals* are linked explicitly with *Jesus Christ*. To be Christian is not simply to be religious, to believe in God, or to accept the ideal of human solidarity and community under God. None of these conditions, however important and laudable, is sufficient to constitute ecclesiastical identity. The church is that community which is called by God the Father to acknowledge the Lordship of Jesus Christ, the Son, in word and sacrament, and to participate in the Son's mission for the Kingdom of God in and through the power of the Holy Spirit. It is theologically and even sociologically meaningless for an institution to speak of itself as Christian, and therefore as church-related, without some explicit reference to Jesus Christ.

What is central to the message and mission of Jesus Christ is the *Kingdom of God* (Mark 1:15, *et passim*). Every major work in theology and New Testament studies today acknowledges and underlines this

fact: for example, Norman Perrin's *Introduction to the New Testament*, Rudolf Schnackenburg's *God's Rule and Kingdom*, Wolfhart Pannenburg's *Theology and the Kingdom of God*, Walter Kasper's *Jesus the Christ*, Jurgen Moltomann's *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, Edward Schillebeeck's *Jesus*, Jon Sobrino's *Christology at the Crossroads*, and on and on.

Although not easily defined, the Kingdom (or reign) of God is the power and presence of God in and for the world. The Kingdom happens wherever God is truly present among us, wherever the will of God is operative. This may occur in the privacy of the human heart and conscience, in a group, in an institution, in nature, or in the cosmos as a whole. Where the Kingdom is – that is, where God is – there is peace, reconciliation, healing, renewal, justice, compassion, and so forth.

The Kingdom, therefore, comes to us as a *grace*. But it comes also, as Reinhold Niebuhr and many others have argued, as a *judgment*. The Kingdom is the standard of measurement of all that is. Insofar as *nothing* that is can meet that standard within human history as such, the Kingdom stands always as the prophetic limit of every human enterprise. Prophecy is understood here as the discernment and exposure of the inevitable gaps between the promised Kingdom and the earthly reality that we have somehow managed to produce in the meantime.

Because the church understands its mission as continuing Christ's, the church, too, is committed to the proclamation and practice of the Kingdom of God. That Kingdom is not only a Kingdom of holiness and grace, as we have said, but a Kingdom of "justice, love, and peace" as well (Second Vatican Council, "Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World," n. 39).

The church, therefore, must have a sense of corporate responsibility for the application of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the "good news" of the Kingdom of God, to its own situation and the situation around it. The church cannot be indifferent to the inevitable social and political impact it makes as an institution, and, more positively, it must exert its institutional force for justice in accordance with its competence, resources, and opportunities for effective action.

To the extent that a college or university understands itself as church-related (which means to the extent that such an institution explicitly links its purposes and goals with Jesus Christ), to that same extent must it perceive itself as part of the larger missionary enterprise of the whole church. Thus, we have moved to the *second criterion* for church-relatedness. I should argue that this criterion is self-evident; indeed, it is almost tautological.

Determining Whether Social Issues Are Within the Church's Mission

How do we know, secondly, that social issues fall within the essential mission of the church?

One can argue, first, on the basis of the church's own constitutional principles as expressed in the New Testament, and, secondly, on the basis of the church's (or, more precisely, the churches') present self-understanding.

A beginning of the *biblical argument* has already been sketched above. The Kingdom of God is central to the proclamation and practice of Jesus. That Kingdom requires a new understanding (conversion) of the world and all of our human and institutional relationships within the world. The apostles and disciples themselves participated in that mission even during Jesus' lifetime. "He sent them forth to proclaim the reign of God and heal the afflicted" (Luke 9:2). And he also warned them of its inevitably divisive effects, noting that they would be like "sheep among wolves" (Matthew 10:16). The prayer that he himself taught them was a prayer for the coming of the Kingdom (Luke 11:2; Matthew 6:9). Without entering the discussion about the historicity of the original event, we can note that there was a strong tradition in the early church that Jesus gave the "keys of the kingdom" to Peter (Matthew 16:19) and conferred on all of the apostles the power of binding and loosing, of forgiving and withholding forgiveness (Matthew 18:18), and the power over the demons (Mark 3:15; 6:7). They were called, as he was, to break the rule of Satan (Luke 11:20; Matthew 12:28; Mark 11:28; 33) and thereby establish the Kingdom of God. Nowhere is this orientation to the Kingdom more explicit than at the Last Supper where Jesus looks forward to his eating and drinking of the fruit of the vine anew in the reign of God (Mark 14:25).

One need not reproduce here all of the texts which suggest a social as well as a personal dimension to the proclamation of the Kingdom. These are considered in detail in Schillebeeck's *Jesus* and are, of course, a matter of special interest in the recent Christologies coming out of the Latin American liberation school of theology, John Sobrino and Leonardo Boff in particular.

The second argument from *the church's self-understanding* focuses our attention on recent official or at least quasi-official statements which reflect the church's growing awareness of the social, political, and economic implications of the Kingdom of God, without prejudice to the many other non-political aspects.

In the Roman Catholic tradition alone the socio-political understanding is evident in the social encyclicals of the Popes: Leo XIII, Pius XI, John XXIII, and Paul VI. The following encyclicals merit special mention: *Pacem in Terris* and *Mater et Magistra* (John XXIII) and *Populorum Progressio* (Paul VI). In addition to these, there is the previously mentioned "Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World" (*Gaudium et spes*) of Vatical II; "Justice in the World" of the Third International Synod of Bishops; and *Octagesima Adveniens* and *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, two apostolic letters of Paul VI. The oft-cited line from "Justice in the World" can stand for the rest: "Action on behalf of justice and participation in the transformation of the world fully appear to us as a constitutive dimension of the preaching of the Gospel, or, in other words, of the church's mission for the redemption of the human race from every oppressive situation."

What is equally remarkable is the degree of ecumenical consensus which is now clearly emerging on this point. The Anglican/Roman Catholic Consultation in the U.S.A. insists that the servant-aspect of the church's mission has "deep roots" in both traditions: "One of the major challenges facing our churches is the cultivation of an awareness of 'unjust systems and structures' that oppress human freedom, maintain situations of gross inequality, and facilitate individual selfishness . . . . Human liberation, we agree, is that aspect of the church's mission of service which is most challenging for our time" (*Agreed Statement on the Purpose of the Church*, October 1975, pp. 7-8).

The Presbyterian-Reformed/Roman Catholic Consultation reached similar conclusions: "Under no circumstances should the church appear as just another social agency. But to proclaim the Gospel with believable conviction and authenticity, we need to show ourselves committed to giving concrete form to the evangelical imperatives of freedom, justice, peace, and mutual love" (*The Unity We Seek*, May 1976, p 17).

Finally, the United Methodist/Roman Catholic Consultation declares that "there is great urgency in today's world for mankind's needs and awesome earthly powers to be challenged by moral and humane values. A central part of the church's mission is to facilitate that process" (*Holiness and Spirituality of the Ordained Ministry*, January 1976, p. 10).

Thus, the recent and present course of the ecumenical dialogues suggests a sharpening rather than an obscuring of the ecclesiological principle enunciated by the Third International Synod of Bishops in Rome (November 1971): namely, that the struggle for justice and for liberation from every form of oppression is a concern that enters the core of

the church's missionary responsibility. It is indeed "a constitutive dimension" of that mission.

To the extent that any institution, academic or otherwise, explicitly links itself with the historic mission of the church, it commits itself thereby to some kind of participation in that mission understood in this fuller, more *comprehensive* sense. To indicate precisely how and under what circumstances the church-related college or university engages in this mission is beyond the scope, because beyond the mandate, of this paper.

Chapter 6

WHAT IS APPROPRIATE ACADEMIC INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL ISSUES FOR THE CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY?

J. Rod Fulcher

There is a touch of irony in this question, arising out of the biblical and historical directives of the Christian tradition: Communities of the faithful *must* address themselves to such human problems as hunger, warfare, and injustice as issues of the faith. Why, then, is it necessary to set forth a rationale for the involvement of church-related academic communities with such social issues as hunger, peace, and justice, as viewed from distinctive Christian perspectives?

The point of discernment lies in the question: "What is *appropriate academic involvement?*" That aspect of the matter focuses on the academic community – in this case, the church-related college or university – as a distinct entity within the larger community of the faithful.

First of all, there is an implicit assumption suggested by the ambiguous identification of "church-related" college or university. This assumption must be examined in order to make a more explicit distinction between the community of learners in an educational institution and the community of believers in an ecclesiastical institution. Although church and college may be "related" as institutions, their corporate identities embody distinct functions within their shared historical and theological tradition. The functions of the two institutional communities, even when viewed as parts of the same body, still differ in their distinctive contributions to the same corporate tradition, and it is this functional difference which underlies the question of "appropriate academic involvement."

There is a further implication in making such a distinction between these two institutional communities in order to determine an "appropriate *academic* involvement" with issues of societal concern. What may well be considered appropriate involvement by the community of believers as a church may not be judged as appropriate involvement by the community of learners as a college or university. It may be argued that the greater the degree of clarity concerning their common historical and theological tradition, the greater the possibilities for discerning their diverse functions within the tradition. There is the additional re-

sponsibility, then, that authorities in both institutional communities turn to their tradition – whether Jesuit, Reformed, or Evangelical – as a common ground for undertaking their appropriate involvement with issues of the larger society.

Without such a shared tradition for viewing diverse functions, there is a diminishing possibility for an informed dialogue about what may be appropriate to the academic community. The theological tradition provides an *internal reference* concerning attitudes taken toward surrounding social institutions. Considered from a biblical and theological perspective within a distinctive Christian tradition, existing social institutions might be viewed in terms of such norms as justice and equity. Without such an internal reference for determining a normative position from a common theological tradition, however, the church-related college or university would be obliged to turn to some *external rationale* to justify its engagement with other social institutions and the critical issues of corporate human existence. Absence of an informed dialogue within the shared tradition leaves the academic community without any professed theological framework to formulate and evaluate social issues from a Christian perspective. A further consequence will be abandonment of a Christian perspective as a viable alternative to secularist viewpoints, leaving questionable justification for the church-related college to claim a position on social issues.

Sustained dialogue within the distinctive Christian tradition leaves open the formulation of questions bearing upon such conditions as scarcity of food supply, distribution of natural resources, and imprisonment of political dissidents. Until such existing conditions are viewed within a frame of values, however, these societal concerns lack the further formulation as *social issues* – such as global hunger, exploitation of environment, or human rights. When the academic community addresses itself to societal conditions in terms of "social issues," there is at least an implicit reference to the human values involved in those societal conditions. A community of learners within a Christian tradition brings an acknowledged frame of reference to identify, formulate, and possibly resolve "social issues" from an informed perspective.

The approach taken toward a creative engagement with social issues by the academic community should reflect this theological perspective within the religious diversity of American society. Such an approach would enable all members of the academic community to address themselves responsibly to social issues, without establishing an official policy that might preclude continuing conversation to interpret the theological tradition. These statements may be more or less consonant with policy

positions taken on such social issues by church bodies, which share a common tradition, depending on the definition of institutional relationships between church and college and the degree of dialogue between the two communities. What would remain essential to the relationship is the question of institutional integrity in dealing with social issues from a responsible posture.

Three Types of Academic Approaches

Academic communities might take diverse approaches in dealing with social issues, each from the particular viewpoint of its own theological tradition. Such diversity may be described as a continuum of experience embracing *three types* of approaches, any one of which may be a faithful response by a community of learners to its societal concerns: (1) the effort to develop an *informed judgment* on social issues by students and faculty through the academic program of the college or university (2) the encouragement of *social action* either by individual members of the academic community or by groups within the institution and (3) the demonstration of a *prophetic witness* in which an academic community commits itself to influencing the attitudes or actions of other social groups or institutions.

An academic community might intentionally move across the entire continuum of approaches or it might pursue a single approach which, within the integrity of its internal rationale for confronting social issues, would constitute "appropriate academic involvement." In either case, the assumptions, strategies, and implications which are inherent in the three types of approaches are influenced by the theological tradition of each church-related college or university addressing itself to social issues.

Informed Judgment

The academic program provides the focal point for the learning community in the college or university. Combined efforts to nurture an informed judgment on social issues center the attention of administrators, faculty, and students on the curriculum of the institution. The process of research, writing, and teaching engages faculty and students in courses. Since the departmental organizations of these institutions provides the dominant structure for the academic program, separate courses shape the immediate context for the consideration of social issues within the curriculum.

Such a context for dealing with social issues makes an *assumption*

that, working within this academic process, the faculty will design courses which provide opportunities for creative engagement by students with social issues. Whether the faculty offers such courses in a department of political science or in a department of philosophy, the courses define the context for identifying, formulating, and analyzing "social issues" in the hope of generating an informed judgment by faculty and students. The procedure of gathering information, submitting problems for analysis, and offering alternative interpretations takes place in the context of the course – all as a working assumption of the academic process.

The basic *strategy* in this academic process, closely related to the departmental organization of courses, proceeds by inquiry from a disciplinary perspective. The expertise of the faculty has been shaped by training in an academic discipline; the subject of study has been organized according to its place within the academic discipline; the method of inquiry has been defined by the academic discipline. The basic strategy in dealing with "social issues," with its fullest possibilities and recognizable limitations, ordinarily will be defined by the academic discipline for the course of study.

There are several *implications* that deserve consideration in reflecting upon this approach to "social issues" in the academic program. The intensive concern of this approach lies with a structured and disciplined inquiry into the subject of knowledge embracing such "social issues" as global hunger, the economic development of natural resources, or human rights. The problematic dimensions of this approach to "social issues" lie in the intrinsic limitations imposed by this same structured and disciplined inquiry within the context of courses. Even the process of identifying "social issues" within the subject of the discipline presupposes a proper context for inquiry – such as environmental sciences, economic systems, and political behavior. There is an additional expectation in moving from interpretation to evaluation within an acknowledged perspective that informs the inquiry. Without explicit analysis of such "social issues" from an acknowledged theological perspective, the implications of that particular tradition which informs the judgment of faculty and students will be lost for the academic program of the church-related college or university.

Social Action

Although the academic program provides the focal point for the community of learners, the very notion of *community* extends beyond the confines of classrooms and courses. The opportunities for personal

interaction, frequently considered as distinctive to the church-related college or university, are usually afforded by the larger community experience. The degree to which the members of an educational institution actually view themselves as belonging to a community of learners will indicate the possibilities for social action as a viable approach to engagement with social issues.

A sense of community engagement seems essential as an *assumption* for corporate response through social action. While individual students and faculty, brought together in academic courses, might discover a common ground for interpreting societal problems, there is no need for consensus on what constitutes realistic resolutions to social issues, even when viewed from a shared theological perspective. An informed judgment should be requisite to social action as a responsible community, but such informed judgment need not lead to an action response on the part of either individuals or groups within the community. It is at that point where members of the community experience sufficient cohesion of purpose that social action becomes a possibility.

A significant point for reflection bearing upon the *strategy* for this approach is the question of motivation. Why should members of the academic community want to take a position, develop a project, or initiate a program directed toward a specific social issue? Without reflection upon social issues from a common theological perspective, members of the community may find themselves reacting to external situations instead of enacting an internal conviction for social justice or human rights, particularly from an informed judgment within their shared tradition. Pressing the question of motivation might also distinguish which recognized organizations within the corporate membership have assumed responsibility for this particular expression of social action.

Probably the most serious *implication* for this social action approach turns on the acceptance of responsibility by the academic community. That may be a lesson learned from the student protests of the late 1960s and early 1970s, whether over civil rights or military policies, which demonstrated division within academic communities and the absence of corporate responsibility. Whatever the prospective outcome might be for students, faculty, or trustees, all are members of the academic community exercising a claim to responsible involvement in social action.

Unless there is a demonstrated commitment by the academic community to an examined motivation and an accepted responsibility, the possibilities for effective social action will be limited as an expression of

institutional integrity informed by a common tradition. That the church-related college or university stands within a theological tradition which has generated significant social action should provoke serious reflection concerning its present mission in society.

Prophetic Witness

Prompted by an urgent need to move beyond informed judgment, advocates for social action by the academic community are concerned primarily with their intrinsic consequences and with a faithful recognition of responsibility for the outcome of their action. Such advocates may recognize the possible influence on other academic communities, as well as upon their related ecclesiastical communities, but the effect would be a secondary consequence of their social actions. When there is a compelling commitment to present peace policies as viable options to violent warfare, to initiate food policies intended to feed a larger portion of the population, or to restrain energy policies that threaten the environment – then the academic community has added a prophetic witness to the claims for social action.

This prophetic witness is grounded in a biblical and theological tradition that calls for social action in response to divine demands upon the community of the faithful. The academic community undertaking a prophetic witness demonstrates the *assumption* that their social action is grounded in that historical tradition. Adopting such a position carries the community of learners closer to the community of believers. That position need not imply a greater consonance between the educational institution and the ecclesiastical institution – between church and college – with respect to official policies on specific questions of societal concern, for the academic community may speak from within as the community of the faithful on the issues of peace and justice. Whether it is a question of economic boycott, of multinational corporations, or of a program for the alleviation of world hunger, the community of the faithful might exercise a prophetic initiative from within the college or from within the church which stands in the same theological tradition that brings its witness to bear upon the society.

The *strategy* for prophetic witness may extend the learning of informed judgment as well as press the call for social action. The support of university research programs to alleviate world hunger, or the expansion of the college curriculum in peace studies, constitutes a strategic approach to prophetic witness within the community of learners. The consonance between denomination policies and academic projects within the United Methodist Church and church-related institutions on

the issue of world hunger, for example, could easily influence other denominational policies and encourage research projects in other church-related institutions. Similarly, the systematic development of the program of peace studies at Manchester College may well extend the prophetic witness of the Church of the Brethren to other academic institutions as well as influence other denominational policies. That such prophetic witness should be grounded in a distinctive theological tradition, not merely initiated as pragmatically adopted, would demonstrate the essential integrity of prophetic witness to the historical theological tradition -- the community of the faithful.

The clearest *implications* for the academic community that undertakes such a prophetic witness is the intentionality of its commitment as an educational institution to a theological tradition. That position makes bold claims and uplifts striking challenges for support from institutional constituencies. It is quite possible that both the influence of prophetic witness and the support from institutional constituencies will extend beyond formal ecclesiastical relationships. That is the kind of social potential which the academic community might draw from within its claimed theological traditions – at the clear risk of professing to be, in reality, a community of the faithful.

Chapter 7

WHAT IS APPROPRIATE ACADEMIC INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL ISSUES FOR THE CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY? THE CASE OF RACISM

Edward Wright, Jr.

"This is our basic conclusion: Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white, – separate and unequal."

Kerner Commission Report
March, 1968

"The safeguarding of liberty does not depend alone upon federal and state action – legislation, court decisions, and enforcement – vital as these legal protections are. Over the long term, it is only through education that attitudes can be changed, prejudices modified, and understanding developed."

W. Averill, Harriman, Chairman
The President's Commission for the Observance of Human Rights Year, 1968.

"The existence of discrimination in the employment practices of our Nation's educational institutions is well known, and has been adequately demonstrated by overwhelming statistical evidence as well as numerous complaints from groups and individuals. Minorities and women continue to be subject to blatant discrimination in these institutions."

Sen. Harrison Williams speaking in support of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, 1972

Viewed from one perspective, a person has to have a large helping of arrogance to begin to approach the topic of *appropriate* ways of dealing with racism in the academy! I have neither the arrogance nor the hope that my views will be adequately informative or finally determinative for any individual to deal positively with the fact of racism. The recognition of racism has to be "owned" personally; further efforts to eliminate racism will require imaginative and persistent work together if any headway is to be made.

Given the peculiar nature and diversity of higher education in the United States, there is no single perspective or experience that would constitute a universal design for combatting racism, even in church-related higher education. While recognizing the diversity in church-related higher education, I do believe that there are some givens, which if understood and acknowledged, could lead to renewed commitment to work toward eradicating the lingering and stubborn effects of racism. Hence, this will not be a step by step "how-to-eliminate-racism" paper; rather, I want to provide a background and raise certain issues that would help each of us to develop the personal commitment toward eliminating racism in higher education.

Background

This spring will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first decision in *Brown vs. the Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas*. That decision, announced by the U.S. Supreme Court on May 17, 1954, signalled that no longer would the legal weight of this nation's courts condone the separate and unequal public educational system that maintained and perpetuated that social disease called racism.

A traditional function of education has been to reflect and transmit the values and beliefs of society, and it is not difficult to comprehend how racism became entranched in every level of education, both public and independent. What makes the educational system racist is not just the attitudes of "narrow-minded" people; it is also the unwillingness of the rest of us to recognize that racism forms part of the building blocks for our educational system and that inattention to that fact guarantees that no changes will be made.

Current Setting

Over the past two decades, most if not all of the initiatives for combatting racism in higher education have come from civil rights groups and from the federal government. Conspicuously absent have been any concerted and sustained efforts from *within* higher education to utilize its extraordinary resources to address and attempt to change the way that most Americans deal with ignorance, hatred, superstition, provincialism, and irrational fears.

In the aftermath of domestic civil disorders in the 1960s, and especially after the death of Martin Luther King, Jr., colleges and universities developed strong interests in hiring black faculty and

administrators and in recruiting larger numbers of black students for their campuses. The majority of these initiatives came at the urging of civil rights groups and enlightened leadership and were quickly embraced by significant segments of our society. As a result, more black faculty were hired, more black administrators were recruited, the number of black students on predominantly white campuses increased, and countless black studies programs were launched.

At the federal level, legislative and executive branches of the United States government sought to focus on the elimination of racism by passing laws which specifically addressed racism in our society. Some examples of these actions were the 1964 Civil Rights Act; Executive Order 11246, as amended; and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. During this time the federal government has required employment audit procedures of all colleges and universities which receive over a certain amount of federal funds annually. By and large, higher education has resisted such moves, but to no avail. Affirmative action plans, including timetables and goals, have become a fact of life for most colleges and universities.

For all of these and other efforts, higher education has little to demonstrate by way of internal change or even minimal impact on reducing racism on campuses and in our society. Significant efforts were begun a decade ago toward confronting racism head-on, but the general mood today seems to be one of backing away from commitments to eliminate racism. One need not look too hard to find evidence that serious questions are being raised about the commitments to eliminate racism and the discrimination it spawns. I would cite the Supreme Count decision in the Bakke case (1978) as well as the numerous lawsuits attacking affirmative action programs. Is national policy that fickle, or was there not the serious commitment to fight racism at the outset?

Church-related higher education stands in a unique position to higher education in general. In addition to the educational and philosophical reasons for wanting to eliminate racism and its effects, there is also the mandate of the word of God that leaves no option about whether we are to do justice and to love mercy. Those values do not take on meaning in a vacuum; they become imbued with meaning only as persons choose to live by them in ways that translate the values from concept to concrete application.

Many of the churches are deeply implicated in higher education because they started colleges specifically to provide postsecondary education for black students. The very survival of many of those colleges is

uncertain. What have church bodies done to ensure that those valuable resources do not atrophy for lack of support?

Looking Ahead

I am wary of unilateral approaches to the problems of racism and will not attempt to offer one. There are some general steps that may be taken, though, to identify areas that can be explored in the interest of eliminating racism:

A. Develop awareness of the pervasiveness and the manifestations of racism. There are many well-documented studies about racism in higher education and why it persists.

B. Take appropriate actions
   1. To influence attitudes directly through sensitivity training and to influence awareness of media portrayal of sub-groups and sub-cultures;
   2. To make structural changes to eliminate racism;
   3. To improve the quality of education by eliminating academic curricular blind spots and implementing realistic accountabilities for all of higher education.

C. Be aware that being "color blind" is not to treat people equally, simply because under our current educational and institutional systems, people do not start at the same place and do not have equal opportunity or equal access.

D. Develop more working relationships between higher education institutions and surrounding communities that would help reduce the barriers between them.

E. Begin to view diversity as a powerful potential for good in a pluralistic society instead of seeing others simply as "different."

Education and educational institutions have the resources to provide our nation with the guidance and technical know-how to make every segment of our society more just and more humane. The ingredient lacking is the will to take on that task.

Chapter 8

WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CHURCH-COLLEGE RELATIONSHIP WHEN THE COLLEGE ADDRESSES ITSELF ACADEMICALLY TO SOCIAL ISSUES?

Merle Longwood

As church-related colleges begin to evaluate the social consequences of the corporate activities from which they derive endowment returns, restructure their curricula to deal with pressing social issues, or publish corporate statements in behalf of the faculty, student body, or institution as a whole, they will have to consider the effects of these actions upon their relationships with the churches with which they are affiliated. It is impossible to anticipate all the questions that might be raised from different quarters as colleges move in this direction, but three basic questions are likely to require carefully developed answers: Is it appropriate for a college as an institution of higher education to take a corporate position on issues of a political or social nature which do not directly affect the college in relations with its local community? If a church-related college addresses social issues academically, what ethical framework does it use to guide its concrete decisions and actions? If a church-related college addresses social issues directly, how will this affect its relationship to its constituency? Although these questions are interrelated, for the purpose of analytical clarity it is helpful to distinguish between them and to discuss each one in turn.

1. *Is it appropriate for a college as an institution of higher education to take a corporate position on issues of a political or social nature which do not directly affect the college in relations with its local community?*

This question is posed from a perspective which assumes that a college by its very nature is an institution established to provide a forum for the expression of a wide diversity of social and political views. The major concern of this perspective is that students as well as scholars must have freedom of inquiry so that their search for knowledge may lead them to conclusions which are not necessarily compatible with the established orthodoxies of the college's founders, administrators, or supporting constituencies. This question has been widely debated by colleges and universities which have struggled to define their positions in relation to corporate responsibility in investment policies, and those

who are interested in the nuances of that debate will find *The Ethical Investor: Universities and Corporate Responsibility* by John G. Simon, Charles W. Powers, and Jon P. Gunnemann very helpful. Institutions such as Yale, however, which provided the context for the interdisciplinary seminar out of which this study grew, are somewhat different than church-related colleges, for they have broken their ties with the religious traditions upon which they were founded and have deliberately encouraged the disintegration of institutional commitments to values except to the pursuit of knowledge. By contrast, church-related colleges publicly affirm their continuing relationship to particular religious understandings or traditions, and consequently they have implicit or explicit moral and social views not only in their incorporating charters but in their contemporary self-definitions as well. Thus, church-related colleges do not claim to maintain complete "institutional neutrality," and they view their task as discovering ways to maintain their commitment to religious and social values while at the same time allowing an atmosphere which will encourage self-criticism and critical re-examination of those values within the academic community.

2. *If a church-related college addresses social issues academically, what ethical framework does it use to guide its concrete decisions and actions?* This question demonstrates the need for church-related colleges to clarify and articulate their understanding of how their relationship to a religious tradition informs the stance they take on particular social issues. Briefly stated, their ethical framework should be informed by their understanding of the Christian's responsibility in and to culture. In his classic study of the diverse understandings of the relationship of faith to culture, *Christ and Culture*, H. Richard Niebuhr described five different views. Each view has its own understanding of the Bible, its own precedents in Western church history, its own denominational examples, and its own concomitant ethical framework. Niebuhr identified the particular strengths and weaknesses of each view – "Christ of Culture, "Christ Against Culture," "Christ and Culture in Paradox," "Christ Above Culture," and "Christ Transforming Culture" – but his own preference was clearly for the last, the "transforming" view. Though different denominations may have historical roots that would place them in different "types" in this typology, most (but not all) contemporary "mainline" Protestant denominations and Catholic groups seem to hold the "transforming" view of Christ and culture in their theological affirmations and social pronouncements. This preference for a "transforming" view among "mainline" Protestants, Catholics, and even many evangelical Protestants seems to have

come about in part because of a global perspective on theological differences. The deliberations on social issues at World Council of Churches conferences, for example, quickly transcend the stereotypes of American separate traditions.

The theological affirmations that inform this "transforming view" seem to have emerged from a long-term trend toward an ecumenical consensus that combines a basic acceptance of our secular, technical world with a renewed emphasis on the biblical notion of the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom, according to this consensus, is not "other worldly" but "this worldly," for it is understood as the transformation of the real world of space and time and history that we experience here and now. Although this view does not suggest that the final ushering in of the Kingdom will be a human achievement, it does affirm that God is acting now through the processes of history to prepare for this fulfillment, just as the time before Christ served as a preparation for his coming in the fullness of time. Closely related to this understanding of the "Kingdom," described in similar language by both Protestant and Catholic theologians, is a renewed emphasis upon the church as the messianic pilgrim people of God. From this perspective, the whole being of the church is its mission. Its worship, preaching, and communal life must necessarily be accompanied by service of the secular world if the church is to be the church. The church's service of the world is meaningful within the context of the community which is founded on the basis of the resurrection of Jesus Christ as the beginning of the new age, the age in which "the Lord of hosts will make for all peoples a feast of fat things" (Isaiah 25:6) – including those who today are the victims of social injustice in our nation as well as in what we call the "third" and "fourth" worlds. The resurrection provides hope for a more exalted future in which life and love, joy and peace, righteousness and justice will be triumphant. Thus, our struggles for the elimination of racism and sexism, for the liberation of oppressed peoples everywhere, have great significance because they are carried out in the expectation of the total love, peace, and justice which will be fully realized in the future.

The ethical implications of this theological perspective require Christians to examine critically the goals which society has set for itself and to help society transform these goals so that the culture becomes what faith tells the Christians it ought to be. They are to attempt to redirect and reform their society in ways which are in conformity with the will of God. However, this "transforming" view provides Christians few definite guidelines, and so they must translate this general perspective

into more operational values if they are to make society more just and compassionate. As they focus on problems such as racism, urban decay, world hunger, warfare, or environmental deterioration, they will realize that much more specific focus will be necessary to provide answers to the difficult and complex questions which these issues raise, but the theological affirmations and the ethical framework that is derived from them provide a needed general perspective.

3. *If a church-related college addresses social issues directly, how will this affect its relationship to its constituency?*

A college's constituency includes those communities from which it recruits its student body as well as those individuals and organizations it turns to for financial support. In important ways, congregations and parishes include both potential students and potential financial supporters, and so it is important for a church-related college to maintain good relationships with them. However, as colleges address social issues academically, it is quite possible that they will encounter conflicts similar to those faced by the churches themselves in the 1960s and 1970s over issues of social justice and the use of national power.

The existence of this conflict over church involvement in social issues is described in detail in a number of sociological studies, such as Jeffrey Hadden's *The Gathering Storm in the Churches* (1969), as well as in contemporary journalism. These writings suggest that the main impact of the churches is conservative and that their chief interests seem to be avoiding controversy and defending the *status quo* for the sake of their own survival. The conflict is usually interpreted on two levels. On the first level, it is viewed as a conflict between the members of local churches and denominational, ecumenical, and theological leaders. On the second level, it is viewed as a conflict between the clergy and the laity within the churches. As a result, Dean Kelley of the staff of the National Council of Churches has argued in his book *Why Conservative Churches Are Growing* that the churches which are theologically and socially conservative and are exclusive in their teaching are growing at the expense of the churches which are more theologically liberal and committed to social action.

Although colleges do not have precisely the same sociological relationship to their constituencies that church leaders have to their lay members, there are important parallels. At the very least, they are both voluntary associations – indeed, voluntary associations with a lot of overlapping memberships – and it is a commonplace of sociological studies that the leadership of a voluntary association can only be so far out of line with the expectations of its constituency before that leader-

ship is called into question. In the light of this sociological observation and remembering the recent experience of the churches, we can note that it is not likely that the colleges will be able to maintain and further develop their involvement in dealing with social issues if they do not think seriously about strategies for informing and involving their constituencies in the process.

Developing such strategies will require imaginative thinking on the part of the leaders of the college community. Their task will be to design programs and other forms of communication that will both inform and involve their constituencies so that their constituencies might develop some understanding of and appreciation for the colleges' involvement in these social issues. Some possibilities the colleges might consider include developing weekend seminars on these issues designed for parents, alumni, and other supporters of the college; organizing interdisciplinary teams of faculty members to address these issues in forums which would be available to address community groups and churches in the geographical areas from which the college's constituency is drawn; and including articles focusing on some of these issues in alumni publications and other publications of the college.

In addition to building support for the college's involvement in these areas of social concern, such activities can contribute to changing the ethos or cultural values of the society. Just as the anti-war movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s contributed to a massive shift of widely held values in this country, in a less dramatic fashion these educational efforts to involve the college's constituencies in moral reflection on the most pressing social issues of the day might contribute to a reshaping of the cultural ethos. Indeed, unless there is an awakening and expansion of moral sensitivities in the culture, it is unlikely that effective and sustained social action to change social structures or attack the sources of the social problems will be effective.

In several essays James Gustafson has argued that churches, and more recently he has also suggested universities, ought to see themselves as communities of moral discourse. Although "new occasions teach new duties," there are more new occasions in our common experience than there are responsible groups deliberating about them in terms of moral duties and appropriate ends to be sought. It will not suffice merely to restate loudly the traditional values in areas where these values are being questioned, but moral discourse and moral judgments will be shallow if they are performed without considering the wisdom of the moral traditions which have shaped our culture.

Bryan Hehir has emphasized how moral awareness or moral con-

sciousness is a prerequisite for serious moral analysis or action. He suggests that people suffer from a privatizing of the imagination, which prevents them from seeing issues from any perspective other than their own. Perhaps significant involvement in moral discourse on the part of the members of a college's constituency, assisted by leaders who have been involved significantly in social thought and action, might help them to broaden their moral consciousness. Some authors have emphasized how American Catholics, for example, have experienced since Vatican II a dissolution of many of the behavioral patterns, attitudes, and structures that had shaped their identity as Catholics. Corporate deliberation upon issues related to the quest for social justice might provide one way for them to rebuild their sense of identity in a new and relevant fashion.

Churches and colleges have the common expectation that society needs men and women who are ethically motivated and intellectually equipped to be responsible citizens in the many occupations and professions which are necessary to sustain a healthy society. As "colleague institutions with a common concern" ("The Basis for Partnership Between Church and College": A Statement of the Lutheran Church in America, 1976), they can each foster dialogue and interaction that will mutually benefit the churches and the colleges. The tradition affirmed by the college in its relationship to the church can help the college retain its distinctive character among the plurality of institutions of higher learning. By relating the insights of faith to the social issues of the day, the college can assist the church to proclaim its message in ways that are culturally relevant and intellectually sound.

Chapter 9

HOW MIGHT THE CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE RESTRUCTURE ITS CURRICULUM TO DEAL MORE EFFECTIVELY WITH SOCIAL ISSUES?

William C. Nelson

The issue here is not *why* but *how*. How should the church college restructure its curriculum to focus more effectively and meaningfully on social issues? But one of the key guidelines for *how* is a clear understanding of *why*. If the church college does not believe that it has a special role to play in examining social questions, it should not get into the business.

The church college must believe that it has special expertise to relate ethical and moral considerations to key social issues; it must start with a basic conviction that it has special freedom to deal with questions of value as well as fact in the social and political arena; it must perceive that it has a special responsibility (a "calling," if you will) to take a leadership role in tackling difficult social questions. If it does not have – that is, if a significant number of the faculty, administration, and students do not have – these basic belief, convictions, and perceptions to begin with, then the task of restructuring the college curriculum will indeed be difficult, if not impossible.

Other papers address directly the issue of why a church college should deal with social issues in its curriculum in some special and significant way. For some colleges, the beginning point for restructuring the curriculum will be to study carefully the reasons for moving in this direction and relating these reasons to broader institutional goals and missions.

Assuming that this basic orientation is present among a number of faculty and administrators, concerned persons can then pursue meaningfully the question of *how*. This paper will focus on two major approaches: (1) models for focusing on social issues in the curriculum, and (2) guidelines for implementing appropriate curricular changes.

Models: Social Issues in the Church College Curriculum

Models are instructive. The models described below reveal that there are various ways to pursue effectively social ethical issues in the curriculum. The following approaches are not meant to be exhaustive, only

suggestive. All of these are legitimate methods for merging ethical thinking and social concern, but each has certain relative strengths and weaknesses.

The Core Curriculum: Freshman Year

Some institutions believe that it is important to encourage students very early in their college careers to think about their value system in relation to social issues. Berea College in Kentucky is a good example of this approach. All freshman students at Berea enroll in a seminar-type interdisciplinary course entitled "Issues and Values," taught by faculty from a variety of disciplines. The major objectives of the course are "to develop an awareness of personal values; to relate those values to the fundamental questions traditionally raised by writers and thinkers who have examined human nature; to relate personal values to important current issues; and to promote communication skills."[1]

How does the course deal with social issues? It deals with them directly and as comprehensively as possible. For example, in dealing with "the energy crisis," faculty point out to students that they "will discover that 'the energy crisis' is shorthand for a complex of interacting problems which include expanding world population, food shortages, resource depletion of all kinds, increasing world industrialization, and resulting pollution. Clearly none of these problems has a simple solution." Faculty go on to emphasize that none of these problems can be approached "without *value* judgments by all of us regarding things like what and how much we eat, what kind of transportation we use, what sort of jobs we prepare for, where we live, what we consume, how many children we intend to have."[2]

The Berea approach encourages students to face difficult value questions immediately (an important assignment in the minds of Berea faculty, given the background of most of their Appalachian region students). The difficulty of this approach is that students have little or no formal theological training to undergird their ethical judgements – but many seek and can find this later in the Berea curriculum.

The Core Curriculum: Senior Capstone Course

The other end of the curriculum sequence, the senior year, is regarded by many as another key time to wrestle with both a personal life view and broader social questions. An excellent representation of this approach is Hope College's "Senior Seminar." The Senior Seminar is viewed as the "capstone" of a Hope education. The course is designed to help the student to "(1) consider how the Christian faith can inform

a philosophy for living, (2) articulate his or her philosophy for living in a coherent, disciplined, yet personal way, (3) understand secular contemporary values in Christian perspective."[3] Most of the seminars – taught not only by members of the religion and philosophy departments but by faculty in the humanities, arts, social and natural sciences as well – focus on both personal values and social issues: "Christianity and Contemporary Culture," "Studies in Conflict and Peacemaking" "Psychological Research and Christian Belief," "Science and Human Values," "Man, Medicine, and Morals."

The Hope "capstone" course is an embodiment of the college's curricular mission. Although for some students it may represent a late foray into social and ethical issues, for most students (and faculty as well) it represents a challenge to integrate earlier religious education, personal views, and approaches to contemporary problems in areas of major interest.

Pre-Professional and Career-Related Courses

Some educators believe that the most meaningful way for students to pursue social ethical concerns is in relation to their future occupations and professions. Thus, a number of colleges – church-related, independent, and state-supported – have instituted courses focusing on ethical issues relating to medicine, law, business, and various other careers. For example, as a part of its larger values program, North Central College (Illinois) offers a course in "Career Ethics." The course includes resource persons from various professions – medicine, law, business, etc. – who discuss with students ethical issues they confront in their everyday working lives. Students prepare for these visits by writing papers on ethical issues in the particular profession being discussed. Another related approach is the Washington and Lee program "Society and the Professions: Studies in Applied Ethics." The program includes courses in three specific fields: medicine, law, and journalism. Only those senior students who have a definite interest in one of these professions may enter the applicable course.

These types of courses have the distinct advantage of encouraging students to identify important ethical issues in areas immediately relevant to their interests. However, there should be opportunity elsewhere in the curriculum for all students to wrestle with these and other moral and ethical issues.

Elective Courses

The course which is easiest to work into the curriculum, at least tem-

porarily, is the elective one. This type of course often arises from the interest of one or more faculty – ethics and biology; public policy issues; values and energy concerns; moral issues in contemporary literature; etc. Many church colleges with four-one-four calendars were able to introduce such courses into the month-long January term where experimentation was encouraged.

Many exciting, thought-provoking, innovative courses arose in this manner, and some have found their way into the "regular" curriculum. Many, however, were ad hoc ventures, which for some was most appropriate, but for others their demise in the face of other departmental needs was too sudden.

The Special Program or Special Major

Another means of focusing on ethical questions in important national or international issues is the special program or special major. Because of a combination of a particular historical or theological background and the interests of several faculty, church colleges have introduced programs in such areas as peace studies, environmental studies, policy studies, future studies – all with strong ethical content. Earlham College, for example, out of its strong Quaker background, has had for several years a peace studies program which includes courses in several departments with a specific emphasis on building a more peaceful world. Gustavus Adolphus College has a similar program.

The approach can serve to highlight special ethical interests of a college, but it may not reach a significant number of students and should be augmented by other curricular emphases.

The Curricular – Non-Curricular Approach

Most church colleges state explicitly their belief that significant learning takes place both inside and outside the classroom, especially in the residential college. Both St. Olaf and Austin Colleges have "values emphases" which seek to engage students and faculty in ethical and moral reasoning in various curricular and non-curricular settings. St. Olaf, which describes itself as "a liberal arts college within a Christian context," uses both the content of liberal arts courses and the contextual Christian setting to emphasize ethical and value perspectives. Curricular elements include a specific "Values" course (usually taught jointly by faculty from the philosophy department and the behavioral science division), religion department courses in social ethics, interdisciplinary courses stressing ethical issues, ad hoc courses in the Interim, and seminars in the alternative interdisciplinary educational unit called the Para-

college. Noncurricular activities include a yearly "Values Retreat" for approximately sixty faculty and students each spring, an annual All-College Symposium (1979's theme – "Theology and Ethical Responsibility"), and a strong, well-attended daily chapel and convocations program which often links personal faith and social issues. Austin College, in addition to a number of interdisciplinary courses with social ethical content, has currently an active "Values Committee" which is examining carefully where values emphases should appear in the total Austin program. For example, a faculty workshop was recently held to examine the kinds of values which were both implicit and explicit in classroom teaching. A convocations committee is exploring how it can make social values questions a stronger theme for the convocations program throughout the academic year.

This type of "all-pervasive" approach on the campus has the advantage of infusing values thinking into the total life of the college – of confronting people at different times, in different places. The disadvantage is that this approach can become too general, with responsibilities too diffuse for making sure that important specific value questions are being carefully considered.

Again, it should be stressed that the above models are representative, not exhaustive. There are other approaches. Some colleges examine key social values questions as a part of an interdisciplinary humanities program, some as "components" of various regular disciplinary courses, and others as a part of a competency-based curriculum.[4]

Models are instructive and yet deceptive. The models described briefly above are suggestive of specific ways colleges can include social issues in the curriculum. Yet none is a "model" in the sense that it can fit readily and precisely into another campus setting. Each college must examine its own mission, goals, and curricular and non-curricular setting before launching its program.

Guidelines for Implementing a New or Enlarged Focus on Social Issues

Fortunately, as a result of visiting a large number of campuses in connection with the AAC (Association of American Colleges) Project on Faculty Development, I have observed most of the above models firsthand. Some programs clearly work better than others. The following "guidelines" point to a number of key issues which seem to make a difference as to whether social issues will serve as one solid focus in the church college curriculum or a weak and perhaps temporary handmaiden.

1. The need for an explicit approach

Some faculty argue that there is really no need for a "values program" or even courses with specific ethical content. Their argument is that values are present already throughout the classroom and the curriculum. Undoubtedly this is true, but the danger of this attitude is that key ethical questions get set aside. The general concerns about ethics and values stated so boldly in the first several pages of the college catalogue remain just that – general concerns. One faculty member involved in teaching in the Hope College Senior Seminar stated this need for explicitness well when he said, "The liberal arts ideal at a church-related school is often a shimmering mirage, but the Senior Seminar has made it incarnate. The course has given me a firmer sense of what it means to be at this college."

2. The need for clear goals and objectives

Courses and programs in social issues have often faltered not from lack of good intentions but from lack of *clear* intentions. Interdisciplinary courses have been criticized – and rightly so – because they were "directionless" or "lacking in rigor." This need not be the case, and in those instances where faculty have worked hard to make goals clear and expectations for student performance explicit and demanding, courses and programs have gained respect.

3. The need for conviction

Many faculty teaching courses with values content approach the subject by stressing "alternative value systems," "values conflicts" and values dilemmas." In one sense this is good – and necessary. But too much stress on value comparisons, especially from an "ethically neutral" position, may become counter-productive. It is not "valuable" to do nothing but talk about values, compare them, and learn to tolerate them. Surely our long-run goal is to assist students not only to understand value and ethical positions but to *hold convictions*. An overstress on dilemmas and options may lead to indifference. Delattre and Bennett summarize this concern well in "Where the Values Movement Goes Wrong," their most recent *Change Magazine* article: "Those not up to the fearful responsibility of presenting their reasoned convictions to the young should choose occupations where perpetual tentativeness is not so costly to the objects of their attention."[5]

Holding convictions, however, requires a standpoint, a theological and ethical system from which to begin. Thus, it is my belief that those

programs which have solid religion and philosophy components undergirding them will be the strongest.

4. The need for social issues as a solid part of the curriculum, not an appendage

Courses dealing with ethics and social concerns should be a part of the general education and distribution requirements wherever possible. This does not necessarily mean that the same course should be required of all students – that has its own problems – but such courses should not be *excluded* from the requirement structure. If they are, they will be avoided not only because students will feel pressure to take other courses but also because students will have received a signal from the faculty that such courses are really not very important.

5. The importance of people

Curriculum is important, but in teaching and learning values, *who* is teaching is at least as important and probably much more important than *what* is being taught. Students can quickly perceive how important particular values are by how well the teacher not only talks about them but *lives* them. Unless persons affirm values in their own lives, such values appear less meaningful to others. Therefore, curriculum development in social issues must begin with recruiting and encouraging faculty who not only have strong academic credentials but also demonstrate sensitivity to value concerns and are not afraid to hold "reasoned convictions."

6. The importance of good preparation

Too many ventures into the interdisciplinary world of ethics and social issues have been made without adequate preparation. Faculty development opportunities are essential because most faculty have received little or no systematic graduate training in this area. Solid interdisciplinary graduate school programs relating ethical concerns and social issues are virtually nonexistent. Therefore, preparation must be done at the church college itself. For example, Hope College and Berea College, in strengthening faculty for each of the interdisciplinary courses described earlier, wisely used major outside grants to support a series of faculty workshops and seminars stretching over several summers.[6]

7. The need for board faculty involvement

Programs in social issues cannot and should not be assigned to a small group of faculty. In some colleges such programs are often limited to

faculty in religion and philosophy. Other departments must be involved. The expertise of social and natural scientists and of those in the arts, applied sciences, and other areas of the humanities is vitally needed. Involvement of a broad spectrum of faculty also says to students and others – "This program is important in the mission of this college."

8. The importance of reward

Faculty members usually look to their traditional academic departments and disciplines for both guidance and reward, and there is often heavy pressure to "do more in the discipline" in order to get tenure, promotion, and salary merit increases. Faculty must not be penalized because they become involved in teaching, research, and scholarship concerning broader social issues. Astute administrators who wish to encourage the involvement of more faculty – especially beyond the religion and philosophy departments – must see that rewards are forthcoming.

A Larger Vision

Is all of this activity, leading to at least some restructuring of the church college curriculum, really worthwhile? Yes, definitely. If our students, and we ourselves, become better at developing "reasoned convictions" concerning crucial social issues, it will have all been worthwhile.

Yet cannot our vision be even larger? Our responsibility in studying important social questions is not only to ourselves but also to our churches, our nation, our international world. In the long run, curriculum development means people development – the development of our students for responsible citizenship roles, but also the development of our faculty for teaching and scholarship relating to crucial contemporary issues. Moreover, if church colleges are to take a real leadership role in urging our society's leaders to take seriously ethical and moral perspectives, these faculty should be given more forums in which to share ideas with each other and with the larger public.

NOTES

[1] *Issues and Values*, Handbook for the Berea College course (Berea, Kentucky: Berea College, Fall, 1978).
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Hope College Catalog*, 1978-79, p. 87.

[4]For brief description of several other approaches, see the March, 1978 issue of the *Forum for Liberal Education*, "Ethics and Values in the Curriculum," which includes a lead article by David Wee, "Values in the American College." The Forum is a publication of the Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

[5]Edwin J. Delattre and William J. Bennett, "Where the Values Movement Goes Wrong," *Change Magazine* (February, 1979), p. 43.

[6]A number of faculty have also benefited greatly by national programs, such as workshops sponsored by the Hastings Center, Institute of Society, Ethics and the Life Sciences and the Yale summer ethics institute sponsored by the Society for Values in Higher Education.

Chapter 10

DOES THE TYPICAL COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY EMBODY IN ITSELF THE PATTERNS OF DOMINATION AND DEPENDENCY WHICH ARE PRESENT WHEREVER SOCIETAL PROBLEMS LIKE RACISM AND POVERTY EXIST?

Patrick Hill and Clyde Lee Miller

Sometimes the most helpful way to respond to such a question is to turn to a context not clearly related to that of the question for enlightenment on how to answer the question. Such is the procedure to be followed here. One place where patterns of domination and dependence have long existed is in the relationship of the nations of the North to those underdeveloped countries of the south. The prosperous developed countries have generally seen this relationship as one where they have provided aid and assistance to those poorer nations struggling to join the developed world. In this paper the focus will be on the way developmental aid has been delivered and conceived in the hope of casting light on parallel helping relationships in higher education.*

Development theorist Denis Goulet has distinguished three approaches to development since the end of colonialism. He labels these "assistentialist," "developmental," and "liberationist/self-reliant." The first has consisted of direct transfer of capital, resources, and technical aid. The second continued aid but with the realization that third-world countries need to rework their social, economic, and political structure for effective development. The third approach aims to abolish the dependence of underveloped nations by self-development and eventual self-reliance so that these nations are able to transform themselves. Each strategy deserves some further explanation.

1. Direct Assistance

Since this approach consists in direct transfers of aid required by a particular problem, it is very efficient in the short run. Such direct aid after some natural disaster, such as an earthquake, aims to relieve human suffering as quickly as possible. Direct assistance will always be

*This paper is dependent on Denis Goulet's extensive work in the ethics of development and mostly summarizes Patrick Hill's application of that work to higher education in his paper "The Ethics of Helping: A Comparison of the Role of Self-Reliance in International Affairs and in Pedagogy." This article is used with the permission of the author.

sensible in such situations, and the problems with it arise only when it dominates the relations between developed and underdeveloped countries.

What are these problems? If all aid were such direct transfers from donor to recipient, helping would be short-sighted, palliative, and narrow – even self-serving. When it is not connected to a long-range, coordinated plan of development, direct assistance easily bypasses the systemic origins of underdevelopment in order to treat some obvious symptom. Such a view of aid may respond too narrowly by looking solely to material needs without recognizing other needs, such as that for self-respect and dignity (which may be based on rejecting external help). Direct assistance can be self-serving if it happens to profit the donor and/or lend legitimacy to a world where glaring disparities in wealth and power are accepted as unimportant.

2. Development Approach

This second approach is based on the recognition that a long-range process is required for any underdeveloped nation to move from poverty and powerlessness into the benefits enjoyed by the developed countries. At first the conceptual measures used to gauge development were too narrowly economic and self-serving as well as based on the idea that an increased GNP would trickle down to an entire developing nation. Aggregate growth was then replaced by an increase in income distribution and popular participation as objectives for development.

The most serious critique of this approach is that even as revised it tends to perpetuate and increase dependence on aid-givers from developed countries. It renders poor nations more vulnerable, more exposed to forces beyond their control. They are forced to trade their independence, identity, and self-esteem for material progress. This is due to the great gap in the distribution of material and technical resources needed for development and to the urgency of addressing the problems of poverty, disease, illiteracy, and unemployment.

A further weakness of this view of development is that patterns of interaction between rich and poor nations are structurally paternalistic– that is, the interaction forces increased vulnerability and undercuts the independence and self-respect of those receiving development aid. The reasons are fairly obvious: One partner has all the resources needed by the other; the same partner dictates the (often self-serving) terms on which aid will be given. As a result, what one "partner" to the dialogue might contribute is effectively excluded, and this same recipient of aid

is made aware of his inferiority and impotence in the very accepting of aid. Such aid fosters dependence that is economic, political, cultural, and psychic no less than in the time of overt colonialism.

3. Liberationist/Self-Reliant Approach

The final strategy is a response to the problems in the model of development just described. Underdeveloped nations have rejected the developmental approach as impossible given the resources required to make it work and as undesirable insofar as the quality of life in the developed countries may not be worth imitating. In its place they have set self-reliance as their goal. First, they repudiate the present sort of interdependence between North and South with its resulting domination by the North. Without opting for isolationism or complete self-sufficiency, they next propose moving toward an interdependence among nations. International relations should be based on reciprocity, and each nation's foreign policy should issue from an internal decision-making involving all its citizens. Relations among nations should not be determined by external economic pressures or the aims of an internal economic or political elite.

On this view self-reliance means decreased vulnerability between nations and national growth based on and directed by indigenous needs and values. This requires creative innovation and adaptation in light of local constraints and priorities, as well as national values and heritage. Self-reliance transforms the terms on which help is accepted from others. External assistance and expertise are accepted only in terms of goals developed and agreed on internally. Only that help is to be accepted which can further self-determination. The point is to empower the underdeveloped nations on their own terms so that they will become full members of the community of nations and at the same time improve their economic position relative to the developed countries.

Conclusions About Helping

First, aid given across great gaps of inequality is humiliating and becomes enslaving to its recipients. Second, many of the current disparities between nations are induced by the dominant partners; this means there is no *inherent* superiority or inferiority among nations. Third, even the terms by which superiority and inferiority are measured are relative, not absolute. For the sake of high material living standards, the

developed nations have frustrated central human aspirations such as solidarity and community by emphasizing efficiency, specialization, and competition – surely a questionable "superiority." What is needed is a reciprocity which respects the relative superiorities both of developed and of underdeveloped nations even now.

Now it is time to turn to American high education to see what lessons can be drawn from these ways of conceiving international aid for development. Although there is much that differs between the two cases (see the appendix to this paper), in both contexts helping relationships make up a major part of the interactions between parties. In education, however, these relations maintain between student and instructor as well as between student and institution – obviously the latter may be far more complex than the former.

Probably very few situations in college education are analogous to a typhoon or earthquake, and so the model of direct assistance may not be relevant. In fact, higher education seems *prima facie* to see itself in terms of a long-term developmental approach. We will examine the relationships in these terms, with the usual caveat about relying on the dominant members of a relationship to understand its real character. We might wonder if students perceive any long-range direction in their college work or experience it simply as a series of discrete, unrelated units. Also, many students may not see any helping relationship whatsoever being part of college except incidentally.

In the international arena the objection to developmental views, we recall, was that helping relationships based on them increased the vulnerability of the recipients, perpetuated their dependency, and lessened their self-esteem. What of student vulnerability? Students must depend on professors' help because of the enormous inequality of knowledge and skill. They are made more vulnerable when they feel forced to trade their dawning independence, identity, and self-esteem for the social mobility alleged to follow academic success and grades. They often trade off non-imitative development and authentic personal expression for the competitive edge which academic success is supposed to confer. They may gain the appearance of rapid intellectual progress by accepting as gifts the results of faculty research, but slow, painful, adventurous, mistake-strewn yet authentic learning becomes counterproductive as long as grading retains its current social significance and is vested solely with the faculty.

Student dependence is fostered in other ways, too. Students are made to feel that they can grow in mastering subject matter only through contact with professors, or worse, particular professors. They

are not provided intellectual resources they can manage, through which they can grow, and on which they can rely for self-directed, cumulutive mastery. Student roles in the classroom may be limited to regurgitation or to reaction to faculty-initiated questions or conversation. Feedback is often confined to "objective" and uncontextual grading.

Self-esteem and self-confidence are undercut whenever students are made to feel that a subject matter or discipline is beyond their capacity. Again, limiting faculty-student interaction to one-way negative criticism without encouragement and praise thwarts the growth of self-respect. Courses whose subject matter depreciates or ignores the values embodied in each student's social-psychological history undermine self-esteem. The attempt to give students the latest developments in one's field without awareness of what is appropriate for the context and goals of their lives is as obtuse and ethnocentric as the North's impulse to modernize the South via industrialization.

Whether a given subject matter is appropriate for students' lives is parallel to whether first-world technology can be appropriately transferred to the third world. Decisions about course material made on the basis of a profession's current orientation seem as silly and self-serving as the desire to send advanced technology to the third world (thus putting more people out of work and increasing dependence on first-world "experts"). Sometimes, at least, subject matter should be chosen in response to needs identified by students; every course should further the possibilities for student self-determination. During the time they spend together the relationship between student and teacher should change so that their relative positions change and the student is no longer so dependent. If students must return each new semester to an unimproved position of dependence on a new professor, only the course numbers are changing.

Another way to get at these problems is to ask how the helping relationships within higher education might be structurally paternalistic. "Structural" is used here to indicate that dependency and vulnerability can continue and increase in spite of the efforts of individuals with good will. Five aspects of higher education are worth noting here.

1 *Curriculum.* Structural paternalism here dictates that all credit-earning meetings of students and faculty are based on the faculty's expertise and mastery of the subject-matter. All conversation is based on explicit or implicit value choices embodied in a course of study dominated by experts. What remains hidden from students is that the experts disagree. All of them would teach the same course differently, conceive it differently, and perhaps even question its right to exist.

Also, institutional organization into departments limits student access to problems and may even suggest that single disciplines can understand and solve problems.

2. *Student input*. The curriculum is organized institutionally so as to suggest that students have nothing to contribute to understanding the issues or to educating the faculty. This makes the curriculum a monologue with conversation occurring only within the controlled space of the expert's private classroom.

3. *Faculty initiative*. All credit-granting activities are related to courses or projects initiated by the faculty with no obvious dimension of midwifery in the curriculum. A curriculum which aimed at self-reliance might leave spaces for students to identify their own needs and to conduct inquiries to which the faculty would be consultants and resources. Faculty roles might be created not just to evaluate students but to acquaint them with options and the consequences of options and choices. A curriculum geared for self-reliance would not permit faculty to play the dominant role in most academic activities, nor would it permit students to accept that role.

4. *Grading*. The system is structurally paternalistic in that it suggests only professors can and should make evaluations of student work. This feature encourages dependency on professors and dishonest feedback; it hardly moves students to a place where they can evaluate their own work and that of their teachers. Even independent study courses do not change this kind of relationship. A grading system geared for self-reliance would recognize that students ought to measure themselves by contextual norms additional to and different from those employed by faculty.

5. *Competition*. College education operates to select out the students most capable of impressing the faculty and thus sets these students in opposition to their peers. Rather than encouraging the growth of all students and introducing them to the academic and other resources present within the whole community, such an education turns the group against itself in favor of those most like the faculty. College could promote collective self-reliance instead, for instance, by providing chances for students to work together on multidisciplinary projects. If this work were non-competitive, it could feed back on the narrow disciplinary expertise of the faculty in a constructive way.

Some general conclusions now seem possible. First, teaching is not an inherently beneficent activity (nor are colleges and universities inherently beneficent institutions). Like other forms of helping and especially assistance which takes place over gulfs of great inequality,

teaching can humiliate the student, lessen self-esteem, increase dependence and passivity, and enslave the student. Here the concept and goal of self-reliance can check the dependency-inducing potential of teaching. Students and teachers alike need to explore the question of what conditions make teaching genuinely helpful to students.

Second, a shift in how students view themselves and are viewed by faculty is in order. Passivity, dependence, lack of motivation and interest, and initiative, even an underdeveloped level of skills – these are not inherent characteristics of students. They are all induced by uncreative environments and sustained by dependency-perpetuating modes of instruction. We need to recall that students will learn readily (without dependence on being taught or being forced to learn) in situations or activities which evoke their energies and interests relative to perceived and chosen goals. In a culture with no real functions for its young people, such situations are hard to come by, but this difficulty should not blind us to the induced character of student passivity and dependence which our own roles often perpetuate.

Third, the relationship between students and professors cannot be described simply in terms of absolute or unqualified superiority and inferiority. A good part of higher education's faculties are too specialized and substantially ignorant of developments in fields not closely related to their own and currently incapable of providing the leadership required for the problems of our times. There is just no such thing as an unqualifiedly educated person. Not unlike the developed countries, we have fabricated highly sophisticated techniques and methodologies but have lost the capacity for holistic inquiry and for addressing value questions.

Moreover, we consistently overlook the fact that there may be values of skills present in our students' culture and in their relatively undeveloped talents. These are or would be assets for faculty development and for higher education's capacity to address the issues of our day. For those who doubt this, there is still the question of possibly developing such student values and skills. We need to design a curriculum which will develop the students' skills relative to both the specialized skills of the faculty and the pressing issues of our time. Such a course of study would empower students to gain comprehensive perspective on current issues, to enter genuine and reciprocal dialogue with the specialized faculties of higher education. Here one might imagine students as agents of intellectual change, as assets for complementing and modifying the overly specialized and overly differentiated character of higher education.

Perhaps students have so long been viewed by faculty as incapable of helping themselves, much less of helping their teachers or institutions, that structures and roles have evolved which create and insure the continuation of passive, dependent, and noncontributory behavior. But curricula can be arranged (and faculty habits changed) perhaps more easily than the international political and economic order. Were a college or university to commit itself to exploring the role of students as genuine intellectual assets and to developing their capacity over time to participate in genuine dialogue with the faculty, remarkable things might happen. One of these might be the alteration of the relationship between the director and the directed and between the privileged elites and the populace at large.

Appendix: Some Objections and Answers

Objections

1. The primary business of higher education is the generation and transmission of new knowledge. Values like self-reliance and self-esteem are not foreign to higher educatio.; but are of secondary import.
2. Most students, as a function of their age alone, are dependent and lacking in self-esteem. Faculty and students are in a dominant-dependent relationship because of the natural intergenerational order of things – this order is not imposed as is the international political and economic order.
3. Dependency is not just negative; it is a positive asset. To teach as if students did not or should not try to become like the teachers they admire is wasteful and utopian.
4. Higher education, of all of our society's institutions, is to be regarded as beneficent, indeed, as the best hope of our students. There is no good reason to regard it as inhibiting student growth.

Responses

1. Promoting intellectual self-reliance and self-esteem is not the primary business of much of higher education. In fact, the major business of much of higher education is not that of helping students at all. (One might wonder how forthrightly the really prior purposes have been made public.) Even so, do the just efforts of higher education purportedly benefiting students in fact promote self-reliance or perpetuate dependency? What are the side effects of higher education in these regards?
2. Inequality does exist and intergenerational inequality, if of a

different kind than political and economic inequality. But the real point is somewhat different. Over the course of a college education (or even during a single course), is there an improvement of the students' position relative to the professors'? Has the experience brought about a relative empowerment of the students, or has it continued their acknowledged initial inequality and dependence?

3. This objection is the most substantial. Growth does occur through merging and accommodation as well as through differentiation from the other, but the point of self-reliance is not isolation from others but community with them on the basis of reciprocity and equality. The question remains: Whatever value one assigns to self-reliance, does the college experience enable one to grow in achieving self-reliance and self-respect?

4. Since this objection embodies the perspective of those dominant in higher education, it may be acquiesced in by many others, but it is not perfectly clear that the impact of the dominant parties is primarily beneficent. Whether the analogy central to this paper is appropriate cannot be decided fairly from the perspective of the helpers alone.

Chapter 11

CHURCH-RELATED HIGHER EDUCATION AND SOCIAL ISSUES

By David O'Brien

The National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Uni... at the University of Notre Dame, June 21-23, 1979, demonstr... continuing vitality of this central and unique component of ... education. The great variety of institutions represented at th... reflected the historic diversity of Christian denominations in ... l States and the almost equally remarkable diversity which exi... n the major churches. These colleges and universities were fou... by churches, participants in religiously based movements for social or moral reform, religious orders of men and women, and even groups of lay people. They cover the entire spectrum of American higher education, from large, pluralistic, urban institutions with a full range of university faculties, to small liberal arts colleges whose teachers and students are drawn almost entirely from the sponsoring religious denomination. While all these schools maintain a continuing relationship with the religious tradition from which they historically emerged, those relationships differ so much from one institution to another that they defy generalization.

The many denominations active in higher education have distinct understandings of Christian faith and mission, and thus differing views regarding the role of social action in the church is reflected in a similar diversity of views in the schools they sponsor. Denominational theological perspectives are mediated on campus by those trustees, administrators, faculty, and students who are members of the church. Each of these groups often has additional concerns and value orientations orginating in their role in the academic community. As academics, they may differ not only over matters of theology and social ethics but also over the appropriate academic response of individuals and institutions to the mission of the church on the one hand and to the problems of the wider society on the other.

Despite this remarkable diversity, there are significant areas of agreement among participating individuals and schools. The overwhelming majority of church-related colleges and universities, for example, have always wanted to help their students live full Christian lives as responsible citizens in the distinctive culture of the United

States. Today, as in the past, they believe that both the church and the wider society need men and women who are ethically motivated and intellectually equipped for full and responsible participation in their communities, occupations, and professions. They insist that the education of young people under religious auspices, far from fostering a mentality of self-righteousness or narrow separation, contributes to national well-being by forming persons capable of carrying out the tasks of self-government. A great many of these institutions go further, arguing that their very church-relatedness allows them to contribute to the nation by freeing them to deal with problems of society on the basis of explicit moral and ethical values. Most colleges and universities in the United States sponsored by religious bodies do not claim a position of institutional neutrality in regard to social issues. Instead, they continually seek ways to maintain their commitment to the special values of their religious tradition while, at the same time, creating an atmosphere that will encourage self-criticism and critical re-examination of those values in an academic setting. They thus affirm a continuing sense of responsibility for the mission of the church and engage in a variety of efforts to participate in that mission in ways which are appropriate in their nature as centers of higher learning.

Participants in the workshop conducted at the National Congress found in the "table fellowship of Jesus" a powerful symbol of convergence. Originating in discussion of world hunger, a problem that has awakened considerable concern on the campus, this symbol suggests both the characteristic concern of these schools to create a spirit of community and to empower students and faculty to share their gifts and talents with others, particularly those in need. Gathered at the table in a spirit of love and friendship, determined to banish fear, discrimination, and injustice and to overcome patterns of domination and dependence within the community, people at church-related schools engage the wider world to combat similar evils and construct a society marked by love and justice, sharing and fellowship. The propositions that follow, which reflect the discussion at the National Congress, are offered in a similar spirit. Each suggests that the church-related college or university measures itself as well as the world against the standards of the Gospel, and that it seeks to embody in its own life as a learning community the very values it uses to evaluate social issues and frame actions to correct injustice and make peace.

1. A college or university is church-related when its stated purpose and goals are explicitly linked to the message and mission of Jesus Christ.

To the extent that this is the case, the institution must perceive itself as involved in the larger missionary enterprise of the church. Official denominational statements, the results of ecumenical consultations, and the weight of current theology all affirm that this mission enterprise of the Christian church involves, as an essential, integral element, commitment to justice, peace, and human liberation.

Concern with social issues, particularly those which have a serious ethical component, is an essential element of church-relatedness, not an extra or peripheral element existing apart from the essential work of teaching and research. The mission of Jesus, and his church, is a mission in and for the world; insofar as colleges and universities seek to relate their work to their corporate faith, they necessarily must engage the pressing issues of modern society in which they are located. Engagement and concern should mark all phases of their life; on the other hand, they can make no special claim to solve the problems of society. The college or university seeks to express its concern and to engage the problems of society in ways which are consistent with its faith and appropriate to its nature as a center of learning.

The church-related college believes it has a special role to play in examining social issues. Its basic conviction is that it has a special expertise to relate ethical and moral considerations to social issues and a special freedom to deal with questions of value as well as fact in the social and political arena. Its special role – indeed, its call to leadership – derives directly from its religious faith and its relation to a specific community of Christians. If a significant number of administrators, faculty, and students, as well as members of related constituencies, do not share these convictions, then the effort to engage social problems will prove difficult and divisive, perhaps impossible.

2. In considering the form of its engagement with social issues, the church-related college seeks in every way possible to consult with and to involve its various constituencies.

Internally, the college or university must attempt to involve trustees, administrators, faculty, and students in an ongoing process of discussion and deliberation regarding the content and form of its engagement with social issues. Similarly, these schools have a responsibility to engage in regular consultation and dialogue with their sponsoring denominations, with both their official bodies and those church members who are related to the school in a special way. The ability of church and college to assist and enrich one another requires such dialogue. In the area of social action, the potential for misunder-

standing is great. The school may enable the church to make its own action on behalf of justice and peace intelligent and effective; the church may assist the school in shaping programs and policies which are authentic and integrated. In church and college alike, the translation of general principles and warm professions of concern into specific programs and institutional policies often involves a movement from deep faith and moral certainty to choices of great complexity and considerable ambiguity. Whether to concentrate on introducing values issues into various disciplines or to take a specific position of advocacy or action, such choices are seldom clear or unambiguous. Effective action requires, and a sense of shared responsibility in the community demands, the widest possible discussion and the broadest participation in the decision-making process.

Equally important, church and college carry out distinct tasks and form distinct communities: one a community of believers, the other a community of learners. What might be appropriate church engagement with a social issue might not be the appropriate mode of engagement for the college or university. Continuing dialogue, mutual respect, and regular consultation are required if the distinct functions of each institution within the shared faith and theological tradition are to be exercised to the benefit of church and society.

The requirement of regular and continuing dialogue with the church and with other external constituencies was reinforced during the consultation by repeated warnings against glossing over with moral rhetoric real injustices within the life of educational institutions themselves. Some even argued that relationships within universities, including those between teachers and students, duplicate the patterns of dependency and domination which characterize global relations between rich and poor. Less dramatically, some argued that relationships within universities are marked by a pervasive paternalism. In any case, the church-related college or university which intends to address social issues must regularly examine itself and challenge its own constituencies if its witness and action are to be credible and effective.

3. The church-related college or university seeks to fulfill its responsibilities by helping its students and faculty develop an informed judgment on social issues.

The college or university is a center of learning where information is available and men and women are enabled to familiarize themselves with social issues and to consider those issues within a framework of religious conviction and Christian values. In curriculum this means an

explicit concern with values and provision of opportunities for students to explore in a disciplined manner the ethical dimensions of issues of public significance. Many church-related colleges and universities are engaged in curriculum reforms designed to make such ethical analysis and reflection a regular part of the learning process. A wider sharing of these experiments and developments would benefit all such institutions.

The most important products of these schools are graduated students. Without exception, these institutions strive to help students become men and women sensitive to injustice and suffering, able to judge such situations in the light of faith, and, as citizens and participants in the human community, prepared to engage in action appropriate to the problem and consistent with their faith. There are other products of higher education, such as finished works of research. Here again the church-related college or university seeks to provide its faculty with the opportunity and encouragement to conduct research in a setting conducive to ethical reflection and serious social concern. The mission of the church-related school necessarily involves concern with social problems; integration of this concern into the work of research and teaching constitutes the most common and appropriate response of the college or university to problems of society.

4. The church-related college or university seeks to fulfill its responsibility for social issues by encouraging informed social action on the part of individuals and groups within the community.

Almost without exception these institutions speak with pride of the social service and social action projects in which their students and faculty are involved. Committed on the one hand to Jesus Christ and the mission of his church, and on the other hand to the free pursuit of knowledge, the college or university rarely mandates social action and never dictates the form that action should take. On the other hand, the values and knowledge it seeks to convey necessarily lead to action; indeed, action often serves as a part of the learning process itself. The Christian institution seeks to insure that actions undertaken by its members accord with Christian values; as an institution of higher learning, it seeks to insure that such action is intelligent and informed. By encouraging reflection and action on concrete issues, the institution takes risks, risks which are inherent in the nature of the work in which its people are engaged.

The members of the academic community take positions, develop projects, and initiate programs on specific problems and issues as a

result of informed reflection. When this is done within a common theological perspective, members of the community enact an internal conviction for social justice, human rights, or world peace, rather than simply react to external situations. Action then not only may be effective in itself, but it constitutes an important witness to the faith the community shares.

5. The church-related college and university sometimes seeks to fulfill its responsibility for social issues by corporate action aimed at influencing the attitudes and actions of other social groups and institutions.

As a church-related institution, the college or university is sometimes called upon to take a stand when Christian values are at stake. It rejects the position of institutional neutrality and is sensitive to its social responsibilities in such areas as employee relations, purchasing and granting contracts, investments, and honorary degrees. Anxious to assist students to apply Gospel values to social situations, and prepared under some circumstances to publically and corporately endorse or oppose the actions of other institutions, the church-related college is bound to apply similar standards to its own structures, policies, and procedures. When circumstances arise which demand a decision to act as an institution in the public arena, as in regard to R.O.T.C., boycotts, or racial injustice, that action should be based on wide consultation and serious deliberation. Finally, it is not the role of the college or university or even of the church to solve social problems; rather, on the basis of its own beliefs, the institution's role is to engage and address these problems and contribute in doing so to their resolution in the wider worlds of society and politics.

6. Church-related colleges and universities must feel a special obligation to combat racial discrimination, both in their educational programs and in their own institutional policies.

Continuing efforts to redress historic racial imbalances and injustices through affirmative action, cooperative efforts with sponsoring religious denominations, and support for predominately black colleges and universities all deserve the special attention of church-related institutions of higher education. The issue of racism was discussed vigorously at Notre Dame. Participants recognized the fact that racism continues to plague American life, that programs of action in higher education have been initiated almost exclusively by civil rights groups or government agencies, and that the institutions themselves, together with

sponsoring churches, have not yet fully met their responsibilities. Predominately black institutions have had special problems in recent years, and the church-related sector of higher education should make special efforts to support these institutions. In the last generation, most Christian churches in the United States have denounced racism and endorsed civil rights legislation. Unfortunately, these pronouncements have not always been followed by serious, effective action. Church-related colleges have yet to express and implement a long-range commitment to racial justice. Here is an area for reflection and ecumenical cooperation.

Conclusion

The propositions set forth above constitute a statement of recommitment of church-related colleges and universities to their own distinctive heritage. In a bewildering variety of ways these institutions are still growing in their understanding of their destinctive mission and purpose, in relationship to the church and to the broader society which, with the church, it hopes to serve. At this moment in history, the human community grapples with a host of awesome problems which threaten the most cherished values of the Christian tradition, the dignity and worth of the human person and the hope of human fulfillment, which place the very future of humanity in jeapordy. Everywhere Christian churches are struggling toward a new vision of their ministry to a world in crisis. In the United States concern with the limitations of resources and technologies combines with the weakening of the national consensus to produce a renewed preoccupation with basic issues of meaning and value. Successful response to these problems requires both competence and commitment, serious and disciplined study and equally serious concern for human rights and social justice. In this situation, church-related colleges and universities can and must play a significant role. Renewing their own sense of purpose, reconfirming their bonds with distinct communities of Christians, they are determined to face the issues of the time with courage and conviction. To the extent they are able to do so, they may well contribute to the revitalization of the church and the renewal of society. As Americans of the late twentieth century, faculty and students of such schools experience all the problems and possibilities which confront their contemporaries. As Christians, they do so with confidence and hope, for their commitment to human dignity, their hope in human possibility, is based on a faith that the human person is

a creature of God, that each person's worth and future is grounded in the promises of the risen Lord. In the world of higher education in a time of social crisis, therefore, the faculty and students of the church-related colleges and universities will be the most steadfast and hopeful of colleagues.

SECTION IV
Forms of Relationships Between the Church and College

Chapter 12

CHURCH-COLLEGE RELATIONSHIPS: SHAPING A FAITHFUL AND VIABLE FUTURE

Robert Rue Parsonage

The convening of the National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities has been a signal occasion for looking afresh at the churches' involvement in and relationship to higher education. In the hope of stimulating further thought and discussion of this vital subject, this paper attempts to highlight the past struggles and accomplishments of the church-related sector of American higher education, to assess broadly the current nature and state of church-college relationships, to review some of the internal and external challenges to church-college relationships, and to suggest what faithfulness to the Christian vision, hope, and sense of responsibility may demand of the churches and their colleges in the future.

Orienting The Discussion: A Brief Look To The Past

In 1643 the author of *New England's First Fruits* wrote: "After God had carried us safe to New England and we had builded our houses, provided necessaries for our livelihood, rear'd convenient places for God's worship, and settled the Civil Government; one of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance Learning and perpetuate it to Posterity . . ." Out of such longing and as a result of such attention, Harvard College had been established in 1636, the first of hundreds of colleges and universities to be founded in the next three centuries on the basis of profound religious convictions and impulses – including the desire to extend the sovereign will of God over his creation, to provide the church with a learned clergy, to increase knowledge and wisdom, to propagate the faith, to increase the sway of church and sect over society and in the lives of the faithful, to serve the common good, and to minister to the spiritual and educational needs of the disinherited of the earth.

In carrying out their mission, the churches had a profound influence on the shaping and empowering of the first colleges in the colonies, and through them a central role in educating the leadership of the new society. The churches established colleges on the expanding frontier. (Of the Civil War, most were founded in the nineteenth century by reli-

gious bodies.) Through the colleges, the churches contributed to the propagation of the Christian faith, to the legitimation of distinctive subcultures and to their perpetuation in the larger society, and to the flowering of learning, culture, and commerce in countless communities. Just as many of the colleges of the church were founded as a result of the emergence of the missionary movement early in the nineteenth century, so the church-related colleges have inspired, trained, and sent generations of young men and women into missionary service and other human-serving professions.

The churches, through existing colleges and in the establishment of new ones, have reached out to provide education to ever widening circles of persons who, before the churches and their colleges intervened, had not generally been allowed to pursue a higher education – among them women, native Americans, blacks, recent immigrants, and the children of the poor. The church-related colleges have persisted, in what have sometimes been described as hostile times, sometimes described as indifferent times, to provide educational alternatives – including religiously oriented or value-centered education; single-sex, predominantly black, or religiously homogeneous institutions; and comprehensive liberal arts curricula and degrees.

While the foregoing material describes in a general way the collective commitment, experience, and contributions of the churches and their colleges to higher learning in the United States, it does not adequately and accurately portray the profound differences of commitment, the rich diversity of experience, and the significant variety of contributions which have been and continue to be made by college-related churches and church-related colleges. Though it is not possible to explore the vast and intricate tapestry of church-related higher education in the compass of this paper, it is important to call attention to some of the highlights in order to understand something of the diversity of church-college relationships which exist today.

First, it is important to remember that the changing American character and experience have contributed to different understandings of the role and mission of the churches in higher education and to the shaping of colleges of the church strikingly different from one another in character and function.

For example, colleges of the Congregationalist-Calvinist tradition have their roots in the "Holy Commonwealths" of New England. Society was based on a religious covenant in which church, college, and commonwealth – all equally under the sovereignty of God – existed in a relationship of shared autonomy, in which no one was given authority

over the other two. The accepted role of the college was to educate society's leaders – merchants, magistrates, and clergy – in the classical disciplines, and thus secure the religious, legal, political, and economic basis of the community. Moreover, understood in this tripartite scheme to be in direct succession to the school of the Prophets, the colonial college had to maintain its academic freedom from both the church and the government in order to fulfill its critical function–even while remaining closely related to and dependent upon the other two institutions.

As the colonies began to be settled in the eighteenth century by Europeans with different religious traditions and other understandings of the desired social order, and as independence was won from Britain and both state and national governments were established, the covenantal unity of colonial New England gave way to the separation of church and state, the emergence of voluntarism in religion, and the rise of sectarianism. Now both the churches and states believed that it was incumbent upon them to establish and maintain colleges; the states in order that there might be institutions open to the pursuit of more utilitarian aims and to new currents of thought such as deism and empiricism, and the churches to insure that correct doctrine would be maintained, new generations of clergy educated, and the children of the faithful continued in "right learning."

While new colleges were established by church and by state, both institutions also sought to bring existing colleges under their domination. There was resistance by some of the existing colleges, and based on the separation of church and state and as a consequence of the Dartmouth College case of 1819 forbidding incorporation of the college as a state school by legislative fiat, those colleges that wanted to remain faithful to their own history and practice were assured freedom from religious domination and from legislative control.

As Wesley A. Hotchkiss points out, those colleges founded by churches other than the Congregational-Calvinist ones of colonial New England after the beginning of the denominational era, though sometimes rent by sectarian controversy, were willing to serve the institutional purposes of their denominations. But "the Congregationalist carried along the Calvinist tripartite concept as a kind of submerged institutional memory. The college was never easy with its organizational subservience to the church."[1] As we will see later, the differences in understanding of mission and purpose cited above are reflected in church-college relationships today.

Second, it is important to recall that the rise of denominationalism

spawned the development of colleges with very particular or exclusive histories, constituencies, purposes, and interpretations of Christian faith and life.

With the opening of the frontier beyond the Appalachian Mountains, the end of a "standing order" in religion and the beginning of the Second Great Awakening and the missionary movement early in the nineteenth century, denominations and sects proliferated and flourished all along the new frontier. The frontier attracted the missionaries of the established faiths who sought with evangelical zeal to convert native and settler alike to the faith. The frontier also attracted religious dissenters who had either been rejected or had tired of trying to reform the churches from which they had come, and who found in the new setting both the freedom and opportunity to propound new dogma and establish new churches. And the frontier, as well as the established cities, attracted new waves of immigrant people, intent on finding a place in which they could pursue their cherished religious and ethnic traditions in freedom. Diversity abounded on the frontiers, and so did religious rivalry and competition.

In order to propagate and protect the faith[2], to fulfill the "Manifest Destiny" which had been transformed into a religious quest[3], and to perpetuate distinctive subcultures and give them legitimacy in the larger society[4], denominations which had previously founded colleges, those which had not, and sects which heretofore had not been congenial to higher education began a race to establish colleges on the frontier.

The fervor with which the founding of colleges was pursued is attested to by their numbers and the intensity of the religious enthusiasm associated with them. But it is also evident in the ferocity with which denominations attacked the character of religion and the quality of education offered by colleges of other denominations, by the nature of the assault on those things in the culture which churches believed were inimical to them and their colleges, and in the necessity aggressive "religionists" felt for bringing some of the state universities under sectarian control and insuring, for the time being, the subordination of the public colleges to the denominational ones.

Still, such negative excesses were outweighed by many positive accomplishments. Through the establishment of the denominational colleges far and wide, faith and learning developed side by side in mutual – if sometimes stormy – interaction. The churches pressed the colleges to exhibit greater piety in their life and teaching; the colleges challenged the narrow sectarianism of the churches in the name of a broader

view of the world. Through the denominational colleges the special needs of discrete groups were being met even as they were being educated for fuller participation in the wider society. For example, the faith, culture, and language of ethnic groups were preserved and nurtured in many denominational colleges which, simultaneously, taught the language, culture, and science needed to survive and flourish in the new land. Many denominational colleges developed local alliances with the result that sectarian colleges broadened their aims and objectives to include concern for the public good. Often dependent on local support for their survival and increasingly aware of opportunities to serve the communities of which they were a part, denominational colleges began to respond to the educational, cultural, and developmental needs of the town or region in which they were located.

And, Frederick Rudolph reminds us, the dynamics of denominationalism gave rise to "the rather expansive and essentially humanitarian desire to Christianize the world" and in the "persistent effort to remind young college students of their obligations beyond self, to God and to society."[5] Much of the rich history and variety of denominationalism is also apparent today in church-college relationships.

Third, it is important to remember that as various churches and their colleges have attempted to respond to great historical and social changes and challenges to the communities of faith and learning, they have developed distinctive educational programs and purposes, pioneered in serving new constituencies and addressing important issues, and introduced significant innovation into higher education and the churches.

It cannot and should not be denied that the churches and their colleges in the United States have – by commission and omission – participated in maintaining racism, in fostering sexism, and in condoning the exploitation of the poor and oppressed. The shadowy side of our national and institutional history is painfully and increasingly apparent. Yet, at the same time, the churches and their colleges have been significant arenas in which such history and practice have been held up to the demands of the Gospel, in which mutual challenge to more enlightened behavior has been made, and in which important advances have occured.

A number of church-related colleges were involved in the abolitionist movement; following the Civil War, a number of white church agencies and black denominations were active in founding and supporting black colleges.

Church-related colleges were among the first to admit women to full-

time study; the churches also first established colleges for women. With the advent of the missionary movement, which had its genesis in the denominational colleges, churches recruited, church-related colleges educated, and the two commissioned and sent all kinds of missionaries – including educators who founded schools and colleges throughout the world. With the influx of great immigrant populations to the cities and the frontier, the Catholic church and religious orders and Protestant churches established colleges to meet their particular needs and admitted significant numbers of immigrants and their children to existing colleges. In addition, churches and their colleges have brought countless students to this country from abroad to study in all fields of endeavor. Also, the colleges have fostered peace and justice studies and have participated in international studies and development programs.

In this area as well, church-college relationships today reflect the diversity of such involvements and the continuing commitment to education and action on the frontiers of social change.

Even this brief historical review provides sufficient evidence to conclude that the church-related colleges and college-related churches in the United States have, collectively, made a tremendously significant contribution to the development of higher education and to the shaping of faith and culture. And, church-college families have been able to make decisive contributions because they have had clear and compelling visions of what faith and culture ought to be and how they, by their own labors and the grace of God, might contribute to the enhancement of both.

The Nature of Church-College Relationships Today

Today, more than seven hundred colleges and universities in the United States claim to be church-related, religiously-affiliated, or Christian-oriented institutions; similarly, perhaps seventy-five churches, denominations, religious orders, and church boards and agencies acknowledge sponsorship, support, or other forms of relationship to collegiate institutions.

Various attempts have been made to understand and interpret this sector of higher education. For example, church-related higher education is sometimes linked with the rest of independent higher education and contrasted with the public sector, frequently evidencing distinctions between the two systems around such things as curriculum, institutional purpose, finance, governance, provision for the study and practice of religion, and more. And, when compared with all other inde-

pendent institutions of higher education, church-related colleges as a group are often shown to be most distinctive for their formal tie to a religious body and for the particular content of that relationship. In organization, curriculum, governance, general purposes – even in outward attention given to religion in its various forms – they do not always differ significantly. Although generally useful, such comparisons provide only a very superficial understanding of church-related institutions and can lead to oversimplification of distinctive differences.

Then, too, scholars studying and writing about church-related higher education have often posited an "ideal type" of institution against which they have evaluated and judged all colleges and universities in that sector to be either more or less church-related, more or less Christian. The ideal type has been based on different reckonings of what are the "indispensable marks" or "characteristics" of church-relatedness, but usually they have included such outward and visible signs as the election of a large number of trustees by the church, the presence of a significant number of members of the sponsoring denomination on the faculty and in the student body, compulsory attendance at worship, and the like. The problem here is that the ideal type may or may not have much to do with reality, the characteristics on which the evaluations are made may be quite arbitrary, and the many differences of history, tradition, and purpose or mission among religious bodies tend not to be considered in such an approach.

More recently, an attempt has been made to look carefully at the history, documents, and practices of a great many churches and their colleges in order to ascertain the present nature and state of church-college relationships – within the denominations and across the whole spectrum of those studied.[6] *A number of findings stand out with particular clarity.*

First, there are greatly diverse church-college relationships among the college-related denominations as a result of differing histories, theological traditions, understandings of the churches' mission in education and society, and more.

For example, when one examines the church-college relationship of the United Church of Christ and its related colleges, one discovers that the church's involvement in higher education is rooted in the belief that God is the source of truth and wisdom; the knowledge that humankind, created in God's image, has unique intellectual capabilities and responsibilities; and the conviction that one of the important ways the church glorifies God and fulfills its task is by providing for the fullest development of human intelligence. The UCC-related colleges, for their part,

accept that they have "a humanistically and theologically important task of maintaining an interaction between Christian faith and higher learning" to the end that non-rational and rational, transcendent and secular sources of knowledge are encountered in the educational process and the freedom of inquiry is enhanced.[7]

Further, since both church and college "are in covenant with God to contribute to the redemption of society by being faithful to their respective authentic roles," and since both church and college are agreed that the support of the church is not for the purpose of achieving any ecclesiastical advantage, neither one seeks to dominate or direct the other, but they understand themselves to be equal, independent partners. "The church and the church-related school share a common concern for the redemption of society – the church through faith in and knowledge of God, the school through learning and the quest for truth. Both institutions need each other to be faithful to this covenant. Moreover, the church needs the school as a tool for its continuing reformation; the school needs the church as a deterrent to intellectual idolatry."[8]

As a result, the relationship of the United Church of Christ and its related colleges consists in a mutually agreed upon Statement of Relationship and programs and strategies to celebrate the historic ties, affirm the continuing cooperative relationships, stimulate denominational interest in and support of the colleges, and strengthen bonds between local judicatories and the individual colleges rather than in more formal or legal ties.

When, to use another example, one examines the church-college relationship of the Seventh-day Adventists and their colleges, one learns that "belief in God's creating, sustaining, enlightening, and redeeming activities through the Son is fundamental to this church's world-view" and "acceptance of the Gospel Commission supplies the motive for its world-wide teaching ministry." Higher education is understood by the church to be essential in fulfilling its mission, and the aim of the church's higher education is to "actualize with the student all that he is intended to become – a child of God and to prepare him for the joy of humane service in the world that now is in anticipation of even wider fulfillment in the world that is to come."[9]

To achieve these aims, the Seventh-day Adventist church operates a system of colleges and universities which seek to provide their students with a liberal education which is experienced in a Christian community and informed by a Christian world-view. The church has set down a Seventh-day Adventist Philosophy of Higher Education to guide and

inform the life and practice of the colleges, controls the election of trustees and the selection of faculty to insure that the philosophy is carried out, and specify standards of achievement and conduct which it believes are appropriate to a vital community of learning and faith.

It should be apparent from these two brief descriptions that church-college relations are indeed varied and, at the same time, that the diversity reflects legitimate differences between denominations as to their mission in higher education. Clearly, the church-college relationships of the United Church of Christ and of the Seventh-day Adventists fit those two denominations and their colleges, just as it is clear that neither church-college system could operate effectively under the other's pattern.

Merrimon Cuninggim has given order to much of the diversity which is reflected in church-related higher education today, and he has presented it in a nonjudgmental way. Cuninggim identifies three groupings of church-related colleges, all of which he suggests are valid models and which can be placed along a continuum. They are as follows:

> A. The Consonant College (or Ally of the Church) is an institution that, feeling independent in its own operations, is committed to the tradition of its related church and to consistency with that tradition in its own behavior. Its values are in the main its denomination's values. They are taken seriously and are evident in the life of the college and the lives of its alumni/ae.
>
> B. The Proclaiming College (or Witness for the Church) as the second category is an institution that joyously announces its affiliation with its sponsoring denomination at every appropriate occasion. But it does more than merely identify its connection; in its program it practices what it proclaims in ways that seem approvable to the two worlds in which it exists – education and religion.
>
> C. The Embodying College (or Reflection of the Church) constitutes a third category distinct from either of the other two but closer to its Proclaiming cousin. Whereas it might be said that the Proclaiming College is one whose allegiance is to the norms of higher education with ecclesiastical overtones, the Embodying College would be one whose allegiance is to the tenets of its church with educational overtones. It is the mirror, almost the embodiment, of the denomination to which it gives fealty. Whether forced or unforced, it is the

> Reflection of the church, true in every major respect, sound in faith and observance. When one walks on its campus, one knows immediately where he or she is, ecclesiastically speaking.[10]

Today, diversity is being understood as normative within church-related higher education and can be understood as one of the reasons for vitality and one of the sources of innovation within this sector.

A second generalization can be drawn from a close look at the many church-related colleges and college-related churches today. There is a widespread interest among the denominations and their colleges to think anew about the nature and possibilities of their relationships to one another.

In the last few years, countless church-related colleges have been reviewing and renewing their understandings of what it means for them to be colleges of the church in this day and age. Whitworth, St. Olaf, St. Thomas, Wittenberg, Austin, and St. Andrews are among the geographically widespread and religiously varied institutions which have been engaged in such study and action. A great number of churches and their colleges have met in conference to explore the nature of their particular mission and relationship to one another – including the Southern Baptist Convention, the American Lutheran Church, the Church of the Brethren, and the Presbyterian Church in the United States. Numerous task forces have been named to study and recommend the establishment or revision of philosophies, policies, and practices relevant to church-college relationships. Such task forces have been at work on behalf of the American Baptist Churches and their colleges, the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), the Roman Catholic Church, Seventh-Day Adventists, the United Church of Christ, and the United Presbyterian Church in the USA. Major studies have been conducted by denominations and religious orders to assess the current state and to plan for the creative future of church-related higher education. In this regard, the United Methodist Church, the Society of Jesus, the Lutheran Church in America, and the Southern Baptist Convention have been noticeably active. Finally, a variety of interdenominational initiatives have been undertaken, at least a part of the agenda of each concerned with the issues of church-college relationships. These include the Wingspread Consultation on Church-Related Higher Education, conferences on the church's ministry in higher education at Duke Divinity School and Loyola University, and the meeting of Christian colleges held annually in Scotsdale, Arizona, in conjunction with the meeting of the American

Association of Presidents of Independent Colleges and Universities. The results of much of this activity has been reviewed elsewhere,[11] but it is useful to comment on it in a general way here.

Concern about the external threats to the survival of church-related higher education and changing economic and political realities within the churches and their colleges has been a matter of particular urgency that has brought people in church and college together for study and action increasingly during the last few years. Frequently, the exchange of views about these issues has unearthed additional problems which need attention, has forced participants to identify those values and practices which are distinctive and deserve to be perpetuated in their own traditions, has clarified the misconceptions, disappointments, hopes, and expectations that church and college have of one another, and has often heightened the resolve of church and college leaders to confront these issues and involve constituents in their resolution. In other words, the necessity in the last decade of confronting potentially catastrophic issues has generated new energy and broader interest in the plight and promise of church-related higher education.

Additionally, while many denominations and their colleges have only had the time, energy, and interest to deal with one or another of the problems confronting this sector, action on many fronts simultaneously by denominations and religious orders is producing widely disparate but potentially useful information for all church-related higher education, just as such action in one denomination or judicatory is sparking similar action in another.

An example which illustrates the previous points may be useful. A number of denominations and their colleges have come together in recent years around the issues of finance. Colleges have sought to enlist their denomination's help in formulating public policy more congenial to the support of church-related higher education; churches and their colleges have struggled to increase church revenues in some cases and to achieve more equitable distribution of declining resources in other cases. It is apparent from reports and action that a variety of initiatives have resulted from such discussions and are having an effect on church-college relationships.

In one denomination such discussion elicited a formal declaration from the presidents of its colleges criticizing the denomination's priorities and resulting in denominational action aimed at strengthening local church and judicatory support for the colleges. In at least two other denominations such discussion has resulted in the formulation of plans for strategic funding of the colleges which seeks to keep faith with the

churches' historic mission in higher education generally while providing additional resources for those colleges which respond to the specific missional priorities of the churches. Finally, another denomination and its colleges have developed a system and appropriate strategies for informing and enlisting church constituents in the support of governmental legislation which is aimed at insuring greater public funding of independent – including church-related – higher education.

The growing interest suggested above is not simply in solving the survival problems of church-related higher education but is increasingly directed at strengthening and expanding the vital mission of the church and its colleges in contemporary society. Further, the widespread though generally independent denominational action around common problems is generating information and experience potentially useful to all of church-related higher education.

There is a third generalization about the present nature of church-college relationships which is related to and grows out of the other two. Understanding increasingly the diversity within church-related higher education and affirming its legitimacy, yet concerned more and more about what appear to be serious threats to the survival of this whole sector, denominations increasingly desire to identify the sources or points of unity within all of church-related higher education which will allow it to rally significant support and to speak with one voice to the wider society.

In recent years, college-related churches and church-related colleges have been coming together in ever widening forums to learn about one another, to identify common concerns and issues, and to discover the limitations and possibilities for cooperative action. Local consortia of church-related colleges, church-related college secretariat within the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and the organization of Executives for Church-Related Higher Education all give evidence of the growing resolve to work together.

Of course, it is difficult to determine all that has or will yet result from such interaction, but it is possible to report what cooperative efforts have resulted to date and where there appear to be points of concensus.

The establishment of the Center for Constitutional Studies at Notre Dame University and the decision of a number of denominations to work cooperatively on legal issues affecting the future of church-related higher education through the Center indicates there is a growing resolve to champion the role of church-related higher education in maintaining a free and pluralistic society and to protect it from what is considered

undue government regulation and intrusion. Likewise, though not formally articulated, there is increasing evidence that the churches and their colleges are agreed as to what constitute the external threats to the future of church-related higher education. With increasing regularity, they indicate that the declining college-going population, rising costs and inflation, the competition from low-cost public institutions, and growing government regulation constitute the greatest threats.

The decision of twenty-three religious bodies and their colleges to convene and participate in the National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities suggests a further resolve on the part of these groups to articulate and celebrate the important contributions of the church-related sector to the churches, to higher education, and to the society. Again, though not formally articulated, there is enough evidence to suggest that the churches and their colleges are generally agreed that church-related colleges are concerned for the education of the whole person, committed to liberal education, value-centered inquiry, the transformation of society, and to the provision of opportunity for exposure to Christian faith and teachings. Further, there appears to be a general consensus among the churches that there is both biblical and theological mandate for their involvement in education; that the church-related college provides an arena for relating faith and reason, for making a prophetic witness to the society and to the churches themselves, and for serving particular constituencies; and that the church-related college helps to preserve pluralism in education and provides a place in which educational innovation can take place in relative freedom.[12]

While the foregoing discussion suggests where the current centers of cooperative action are and what appear to be the areas where considerable consensus exists, there is no agreement yet about what constitutes the compelling source or points of unity which many believe must be discovered if church-related higher education is to achieve a greater sense of common cause or begin to speak to the larger society with a more unified voice.

Challenges to Church-College Relationships

A survey of the church-related higher education scene today makes it evident that there are a number of issues which pose a challenge to church-related higher education and have specific implications for church-college relationships. Prominent among these are the following:

The churches and their colleges are challenging one another to clarify

their respective roles and to strengthen their mutual accountability. In some cases the challenge has resulted from feelings of estrangement; in other cases it represents a reawakened interest in one another. In some cases it is an on-going process of renewal; in other cases it has been a signal event establishing a new level or kind of relationship. As a result, a number of denominations have written or revised statements of philosophy, statements of relationships, and covenants. The import of this action is that it is providing an occasion for churches and their colleges to clarify institutional purposes, to set out mutual expectations, to agree upon the nature of services and support that each will provide the other, and to establish methods of reporting, for evaluating process toward agreed-upon goals, and for renewing and revising the relationship or covenant.

In their mutual resolve to challenge and strengthen one another in the faith, a number of denominations and religious orders and their colleges are attempting to determine what demands the Christian faith places on the colleges in a particularly urgent and compelling way. Further, they are attempting to determine how the colleges, as educational institutions, can best respond to those issues in terms of curriculum, campus life, and institutional policy and in the ways they provide leadership to the churches and to the society. As a result of such explorations, there is a growing conviction in some churches and their colleges that the colleges ought to do more to undergird the faith and morality of students; in others, to address more effectively questions of value and life meaning; in others, to respond to pressing social issues and global needs; in still others, to more faithfully fulfill institutional or corporate social responsibilities. And, as a new measure of clarity or priority has been achieved, a significant number of churches and their colleges have begun to devise strategies, provide funds, and initiate programs to fulfill new or revitalized educational missions. A number of denominations are providing grants to strengthen innovative student ministries, to underwrite extension courses for ministers and laity; others are providing grants to their colleges to support research, teaching, and development around the issue of world hunger. The Brethren and Catholics are both involved in the development and support of peace and justice studies in their related colleges which have as a part of their rationale the infusion of church and society with the results of their work.

The churches and their colleges are being challenged to confront differing images and expectations their constituents have of church-college relationships and to accommodate differing collegiate under-

standings or commitments to the church connection. In an increasingly pluralistic society, in which Christian commitment differs significantly and fewer and fewer church members attend church-related colleges, there are growing differences among constituents about what the role of the church-related college ought to be and, therefore, how well it is meeting the expectations of constituents. Further, insofar as there are great differences within some denominations as well as between them in terms of what is considered to be appropriate in church-college relations, there is a need to consider whether or not, and if so, how, such diversity can be accommodated and/or effectively celebrated. Here, too, there has been a good deal of creative and productive study and action of late. A number of studies – most notably the Lutheran Church in America study of images and expectations and the Jesuit study of their mission in higher education – have sought to identify the images and expectations staff and constituents have of the colleges and to map out strategies for dealing with the findings. Further, a number of churches and their colleges have been at work drafting or redesigning statements of relationship and covenants to the end that they may incorporate diversity with integrity, just as some other denominations and their colleges have sought to work out such concepts as strategic funding to differentiate among colleges on the basis of their commitments to the missional priorities of the church.

The churches and their colleges face the challenge of determining how, together, they can best support and contribute to the continuing viability of the colleges while maintaining their faith commitments. As a result of both the growing threat to the survival of church-related higher education and the increasing interest and commitment of churches and colleges to the strengthening of their relationship, there have been much study and action around the issues of financial support from the churches as mentioned earlier. At the same time, there is a widespread realization that the first line of defense in continuing support and protection for church-related higher education is a public policy congenial to this sector. In this regard, the Mormons, Lutherans, Catholics, and Methodists have been most active in advocating constitutional protection for church-related higher education, in making a strong case for public support of this sector, in structuring church-college relationships in such a way as to maximize the church's role in higher education while anticipating or meeting constitutional tests, and in developing strategies for involving a widening circle of denominations and their constituents in the advocacy of supportive public policy. But, admittedly, the churches and their colleges have only begun to

address this difficult and complex issue.

Finally, in a more general but no less compelling way, church-related higher education is being challenged by various forces within the society as a whole to demonstrate what is truly distinctive about it and to justify its own claim that it is an indispensable part of American higher education. Here, the church-related sector must often deal with the charge that it is primarily sectarian and therefore ought not to be eligible for public funding; or that, despite its rhetoric, church-related education does not contribute significantly to the pluralism and diversity of higher education and American society and therefore does not merit special public support; or that it does not live up to its own profession of faith and educational purpose and therefore cannot be looked to for leadership in the development of value-centered education, for innovation in teaching, or for dealing with critical societal needs.

Those knowledgeable about the variety, intentionality, and vitality of church-related higher education are rightly critical of these and similar challenges. The aforementioned criticisms are indiscriminate: to speak of all of church-related higher education without distinction is naive. Such criticisms lack precision; they often are little more than sweeping generalizations, unsupported by specific facts. They single out church-related higher education for undue criticism; here church-related higher education is judged on the basis of its own highest ideals rather than against the profession and performance of the rest of American higher education.

But, to dismiss such criticisms out of hand – as is too often the case – does not deal adequately with two facts. First, the general public is not much aware of nor greatly interested in distinctions among the variety of institutions of church-related higher education. And, public policy making bodies try – for the sake of efficiency and equity – to deal with church-related higher education as a sub-system in the broader educational system. Thus, stereotypes, media images, and "horror stories" about church-related higher education often inform the general public and influence the decisions of public policy makers. Second, in spite of that fact, church-related higher education has not gotten its game together enough to present a more substantive and compelling image to the public – to show forcefully and with precision how, as a sub-system of higher education, it provides an alternative world-view or interpretation of knowledge than that espoused by the rest of higher education, serves both its own constituency and the public good with sensitivity and integrity, and provides a unique context in which truth and meaning

can be pursued to the benefit of all of education and the whole society.

Insofar as these challenges represent something of the range and substance of critical issues in the area of church-college relations, it is possible to make the following general observations. It is evident that significant progress is beginning or continues to be made within denominational contexts to define and articulate the religious basis of church-related college relationships and of appropriate institutional roles. Indeed, churches and their colleges generally are becoming more positive and imaginative in this regard, more desirous of understanding and affirming what is religiously distinctive and compelling for them. But, beyond the denominational context, where the challenges emanate from the broader public and are directed to the whole sub-system of church-related higher education, little progress has yet been made in indentifying and demonstrating the religious sources of unity which underlie the diversity of church-related higher education and are the primary bases which distinguish it from the rest of higher learning in America. To be sure, the churches and their colleges are willing increasingly to find common cause and present a more united front on a political and legal basis, but they have not demonstrated a similar willingness to search for and articulate such a common front in terms of fundamental religious and theological principles.

Because the churches and their colleges have not undertaken this task, there is neither a very clear and compelling vision of what is distinctive about the whole of church-related higher education nor a forceful and commanding sense of where the frontiers are for this sector collectively. Yet, progress on a number of fronts does seem to be indicated and necessary if church-related higher education is to find a common voice to speak effectively to the whole society and continue to play a leading role in the whole of higher education.

The Frontiers of Church-College Relations

In this all-too-brief assessment of church-college relations there has been much to affirm: a continuing sense of pride in the pioneering work that the churches and their colleges have played in the development and shaping of higher education in this country, and a growing awareness of the great diversity within church-related higher education and of the legitimate way that diversity represents the faithfulness of churches and their colleges to their understandings of the mission in higher education. Further, it is important to affirm the increasingly widespread and energetic involvement of the churches and their colleges

in study and action around issues of church-college relations, in attempts to deal forthrightly and creatively with many of the challenges to church-college relations, and in raising the unresolved questions and issues that must be faced if church-related higher education is to remain strong and renew its vision and purpose.

In light of these affirmations, there are at least two tasks which are vitally important in the area of church-college relations, understood in a broad context. First, because there has been so much study and action in the area of church-college relations in the last decade, there is a continuing task of sharing the research and findings more broadly and systematically.

Much progress has been made in sharing denomination-wide studies, statements, and policies regarding church-college relationships with other denominations and associations. Indeed, this Congress stands to advance the dissemination and discussion of such material substantially. But as middle judicatories and their related colleges, and individual colleges and churches can share with the wider church-college family the process and products of their own struggles with what it means to be college-related churches and church-related colleges, more formal statements and policies will take on greater practical reality, and churches and colleges may become more useful resources to one another across religious lines, from the local community level to the national level. The insights individual colleges may have about the ways to engage constituents in vital, continuing explorations of church-college relations; the processes which denominations or religious orders and their colleges are devising for communicating and sharing responsibility with one another in the area of church-college relations; the policies being developed at the middle judicatory level to enliven mutual knowledge, understanding, and caring for one another by churches and colleges – all is useful information that is transferable from one denomination to another, and potentially of enormous significance to institutions concerned with similar problems or issues.

Second, this discussion suggests that there are at least two major issues which define the frontiers of discussion and action in regard to church-college relations and which deserve the attention of such an interdenominational gathering as this Congress represents. The issues are these: First, is it possible both to affirm the diversity represented in church-college relations and, simultaneously, to come to some agreement about the source and nature of the unity which underlies and sustains that diversity? Second, what are the new missional tasks which church-related colleges and college-related churches are called to serve

today – tasks which are as clear, compelling, and venturesome as those which brought these colleges into being and gained them support in the first place?

First, is it possible both to affirm the diversity represented in church-college relationships and, simultaneously, come to some agreement about the source and nature of the unity which underlies and sustains that diversity?

It is important to address this thorny question – partly because it is a logical next step in the interdenominational dialogue about church-college relationships; also because denominational interest in discussion on an interfaith basis cannot long be sustained unless there is consideration of common religious values as well as common educational principals; and because the churches and their colleges must develop as distinctive and encompassing a rationale as they can for all of church-related higher education if it is to be sustained as an indispensable part of American higher education. But the task is not without its difficulties.

Discussion of this question must be approached with great sensitivity to all the churches and colleges that comprise the church-related sector. For instance, on the one hand, there must be due regard for the convictions of those who believe that specific formulations of Christian belief and purpose cannot be compromised for the sake of broader agreement; and on the other hand, there must be equal regard for the convictions of those who believe that significant distance between church and college must be maintained – particularly in matters of religious faith and doctrine – if both are to remain free to pursue their appropriate and distinctive functions. And, the discussion must be approached with a realistic understanding of the current state of Christian unity.

Observers of the ecumenical scene – both in the United States and worldwide – note that "ecumenism has moved from its earlier rhetoric of death to denominationalism to a new sense of confessionalism."[13] This is so, according to Joseph Eagan, S.J., for at least two reasons. Confessional identity and tradition continue to be cherished, and the kind of doctrinal consensus that many had thought was flowering has turned out to be more imagined than real. Still, as Paul A. Crow, Jr. has recently pointed out, even though the churches today frequently ignore or minimize their ecumenical calling, "The Bible and the normative teachings of the churches affirm the unity of the Church . . . Unity belongs to the essence of the church; division is contrary to God's will."[14] In light of such realities – the contradictions between them – the counsel of Avery Dulles is helpful. He writes that those who seek to be faithful to the unity to which God calls the church must, in the

decade ahead, "enter into profound dialogue with each other while witnessing to the authentic Christianity expressed in their deeply held traditions."[15] Consensus in this important area cannot be taken for granted; nor can consensus-building come without hard, faithful work.

Given the foregoing understandings, it would seem that the question itself must be stated more precisely. That is: Is it possible to affirm a common ground or define the nature of the unity which is basic to the mission of the churches and their colleges in education, at the same time affording all denominations the opportunity to describe in appropriately confessional ways what that mission means to them in all of its particularity? And, can it be accomplished with such sensitivity that there is no attempt of one church or college group to impose its own understanding on others or judge another's faithfulness on the basis of its own understanding?

Within the church-related college sector there is a natural starting point for discussion of the question at hand. A reading of a great number and variety of recently negotiated or revised theological rationales which underlie statements of philosophy, statements of relationship, and covenants between churches or religious orders and their colleges contain significant common elements. For example, many statements assert that God is the source of knowledge and truth; that the world, created by God and redeemed in Jesus Christ, is good and knowable; that humankind is created in the image of God, with potentialities and responsibilities given no other creatures; that the nurturing of the intellectual and spiritual capacities of men and women, the discovery of truth, and the advancement of the welfare of society provide the motive for the church's involvement in higher education. Further, many such statements contend that the church-related college is understood to be an institution in which the relation of faith and reason may be freely explored, the freedom and responsibility of persons can be enhanced, the prophetic witness of the church may be expressed to the broader society, and the discovery and celebration of life's meaning – in all of its dimensions – is provided for and encouraged.[16]

While such tenets would need to be carefully explored, the authority they have within the various religious traditions and their colleges would need to be ascertained, and the meaning they hold for the whole of church-related higher education would need to be clearly circumscribed, it is possible that these and/or other elements might be broadly affirmed and provide the basis for a common mission statement that would be helpful in establishing the distinctive contribution of church-

related higher education to the higher learning in the United States. Or, to paraphrase Avery Dulles: If the churches and their colleges can enter into profound dialogue with one another around the issues of unity, while witnessing to the authentic Christian faith and practice expressed in their deeply held traditions, a truer consensus about the religious basis or nature of their mission than now exists may emerge.

Second, what are the new missional tasks which church-related colleges and college-related churches are called to serve today – tasks which are as clear, compelling, and venturesome as those which brought these colleges into being and gained them support in the first place?

While other Commissions of the Congress are dealing with the purposes of church-related higher education and the nature of the great social issues which this sector is facing and to which it has an opportunity to respond, it is important to deal with the issue of mission here as well. In a significant sense, it is as the churches and their colleges struggle to understand what faithfulness to God and neighbor means in contemporary terms that they are able to identify and wrestle with those issues and problems that demand their joint attention and action. And, in such wrestling, the nature of church-college relationships is continually being challenged and renewed. Further, it is important to discuss this question in interdenominational forum. What is needed today, lest precious resources are squandered, systemic problems get dealt with in a cursory way, and education is left unchanged at its core, is a more coordinated and comprehensive approach to the educational mission of the churches and their colleges. And, while working together around such issues may be more effective and innovative, it is also possible that the churches and their colleges may develop in the process a more ecumenical vision of the kind of world in which we want to live and for which we need to educate responsible human beings.

Among these new frontiers being identified by churches and their colleges – some not new frontiers, but all demanding new or continuing responses – are the following ones.

A critical task for the church-related college, to employ the provocative phrase of Joseph E. Kauffman, is "to start a resistance movement against all those forces which shrivel the human spirit."[17] Some who define such a role for the church-related college suggest that, by championing the search for meaning and purpose as a basic goal of the college curriculum, the narrow rationalism which remains dominant in much of education can be challenged. Some contend that, in maintaining their commitment to the arts and sciences, their belief in the importance of non-rational as well as rational ways of knowing, and

their concern for the education of persons wholistically, church-related institutions will be making a valuable contribution to overcoming the fragmentation of knowledge so characteristic of the modern university. Some suggest that, by helping students deal with the question: What shall I do with my life? as well as with the question: How shall I make a living?, church-related colleges will be providing resistance to the tendency toward constricting vocationalism in education. Finally, some suggest that, through its participation in a world-wide community of faith and in its commitment to a worldview rooted in the transcendent, the church-related college will help to overcome the narrowness of vision and the provincialism that threaten so clearly to "shrivel the human spirit."

While many church-related colleges excel in fulfilling one or more of these aims, the challenge is to incorporate them all in such a way as to create a cohesive and comprehensive educational experience which both serves the practical needs of students and, to paraphrase Parker Palmer, takes them out of their normal course and puts them in a different place with different eyes to view the world.[18]

A second critical task confronting church-related higher education is that of taking religion seriously in all of its dimensions in its whole institutional life. Much of what is important here is summed up by Merrimon Cuninggim in his description of two of the essentials of church-relatedness for the college. He states, "to be church related, a college must make proper provision for religion in all its dimensions, in at least rough harmony with the views of its sponsoring denomination;" and, "to be church related, a college must put its values and those of its church into recognizable operation in every aspect of the life of the institution, including the functions of scholarship, teaching, and learning, as well as in personnel practices and the campus ethos. Or, since most of us aren't anticipating the millenium anytime soon, the college must try to do so and give evidence that it is trying."[19]

Most church-related colleges are concerned about and provide at least some of the resources necessary for the study of religion and resources which enhance the practice of religion by individuals and faith communities. But increasingly the church-related college is being challenged to embody its understanding of and commitment to its religious heritage and responsibility in the structuring of its community life and in the formation of its institutional policies. Equality of educational opportunity for all; fair and equitable wages and humane working conditions for every employee; the pursuit of affirmative action in hiring and promotion; an active concern for corporate social

responsibility in institutional investments ought to be of special concern to church-related higher education – not simply because they are enlightened educational institutions, but more profoundly because it is essential to their nature that they constantly struggle to be communities of learning informed by faith, to become centers of knowledge infused with justice. It is untenable for church-related colleges to profess value neutrality in such matters, for that stance often bespeaks acquiescence to whatever values are in vogue. Religious intentionality demands commitment, the making of ethical choices, on an institutional as well as an individual basis.

A third critical task of the church-related college and the college-related church is to determine how they can most creatively, responsibly, and strategically serve the needs and interests of one another in a rapidly changing educational, religious, and social environment. As evidenced in the preceeding pages, both changing conditions and more open questioning of relationships present new opportunities for mutuality in mission. For example, it has become increasingly apparent that unless there is public policy which is congenial to the support and protection of the church-related college, the survival of much of this sector of higher education is extremely doubtful. Therefore, if the churches and their colleges can begin to map out strategies by which church members are informed about crucial issues affecting higher education, enlisted in lobbying and voting for favorable public policy, and encouraged to accept a new role for themselves as citizens committed to the continuation of the church-related college as an important contribution to the public good, lay men and women can begin to assume a new but nonetheless strategic function in support of church-related higher education.

To cite another example, if churches – at the denominational, judicatory, and local levels – are to continue to carry out their ministry and mission in an intelligent and compassionate way, they need continually to grow in knowledge of the faith and in understanding of the world which is the context of mission and ministry. The church-related colleges are a significant resource of the continuing education of the churches, though they have not been thought of nearly enough in this way. As churches and colleges can work together to establish that the colleges are a vital educational resource for the whole church – not just for individual students – exciting possibilities can open up. College faculty could teach and consult with churches on a whole variety of subjects and problems; churches could be tied into collegiate computer, information retrieval, and audio-visual systems; college and church

facilities could be used more strategically by both institutions to carry out their programs. Challenged to look anew at institutional needs and the most creative possibilities of relationship, church and college may discover many new and strategic ways to serve each other.

A fourth critical task of the church-related college and the college-related church is that of becoming more aware of and true to the demands of global interdependence. Such a concern must necessarily be on the minds of all who are concerned about the quality – indeed, the survival – of life on "space ship earth." But it is important to remember that the church and its colleges both bring particular assets and commitments to this concern which, when creatively related, equip them for a distinctive role of leadership in fostering global understanding and action. Both the Christian community and the community of learning transcend the boundaries of nation, race, and class; at the same time, they are rooted in every place and culture – forming international networks of people and institutions, at least somewhat open and responsive to one another. Very few international communities compare with these two in the outreach and commitment which they represent. The commitment of higher education to the quest for truth and of the church for the establishment of peace and justice inform, correct, and challenge one another to a more wholistic view of life and human responsibility in it. As the resources of church and college are offered to one another and the values out of which each operates are brought into interaction, new possibilities for learning and living in the world emerge. The Peace and Justice pilot project of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities and the United Methodist Church's support of hunger studies, research, and action in its own and other colleges are but two current examples of creative leadership which church-related higher education is giving in this area and points up the need for increased attention to the issues of global interdependence.

Finally, a critical task for church-related higher education, inextricably related to those above, is the unending but indispensable one of attempting to build true community. In a little essay entitled "A Place Called Community," Parker Palmer distinguishes between false and true community. He writes, in part:

> The differences between true community and false could be listed at length. For instance, false communities tend to be manipulated by the state, while true community is independent of governmental power. . . .In false communities the group is always superior to the individual, while true com-

munities strive to unite persons across socially fixed lines. . . .

But beyond all these sociological distinctions between true community and false, there is a theological way of expressing the differences which brings us to the heart of the matter. False communities are idolatrous. They take some finite attribute like race, creed, political ideology, or even manners, and elevate it to ultimacy. They seek security by trying to make timeless that which should be viewed critically. They confuse their own power with the power of God and tragically try to use that power to decide questions of life and death. False communities are ultimately demonic, which is not to say that true communities are divine, for both retain their human character. But true communities will take the form of covenant. They will experience both God's mercy and God's judgment in their lives.[20]

In striving to become such a true community, the church-related college is driven to call upon all of the resources of its dual tradition as a place of faith and learning and to draw on its finest powers of imagination and transcendent hope. And it is in such striving that it can likely make its greatest contribution to the transformation of culture and the fulfillment of its mission.

How church-related colleges and college-related churches are engaged in exploring these frontiers needs to be examined in greater depth. The understanding of religious responsibility as a motivating factor and a basis for determining the appropriate roles of church and college on the frontiers demands a great deal of discussion. And the extent to which the church-related sector of higher education can begin to find common cause around these or other frontiers will take a great deal of patient exploration. But the hope of discovering an ever more vital mission and of playing an ever more decisive role in the education of God's people will sustain church-related higher education in the task.

SOURCES

[1]Wesley Hotchkiss, "The Prophet Academy: An Historical Perspective on UCC Related Colleges," *Journal of Current Social Issues*, Vol. 14, No. 2, Spring, 1977, p. 69.

[2]Donald G. Tewksbury, *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War*, New York: Archon Books, 1965.

[3]Charles E. Peterson, Jr., "The Church Related College: Whence Before Whither," *The Contribution of the Church-Related College to the Public Good*, Samuel H. Magill, editor, Washington: Association of American Colleges, 1970.

[4]Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution*, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969.
[5]Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University*, New York: Vintage Books, 1962, p. 70.
[6]Robert Rue Parsonage, editor, *Church Related Higher Education: Perceptions and Perspectives*, Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1979.
[7]"A Statement of Relationship," approved by the Seventh General Synod of the United Church of Christ, June, 1969, *Educational Institutions Related to the United Church of Christ*, p. 1.
[8]"The Case for Church-Related Higher Education," a statement of the Council for Higher Education of the UCC, *Journal of Current Social Issues*, Vol. 14, No. 2, Spring, 1977, p. 89.
[9]Seventh-day Adventist Philosophy of Higher Education, 1972, mimeographed.
[10]Merrimon Cuninggim, "Varieties of Church-Relatedness in Higher Education," *Church Related Higher Education: Perceptions and Perspectives*, Robert Rue Parsonage, editor, pp. 32-36.
[11]Robert Rue Parsonage, "An Overview of Current Denominational Policies and Studies in Higher Education," *Ibid.*
[12]*Ibid.*, pp. 282-291.
[13]Joseph Eagan, S.J., "A Creative Ecumenical Initiative: The World Council of Churches Challenges Its Member Churches," *Mid-Stream*, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, p. 131.
[14]Paul A. Crow, Jr., "Foundations for Ecumenical Commitment," prepared for presentation to NCCC Governing Board, May 9, 1979, mimeographed, p. 4.
[15]Avery Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1977, p. 189.
[16]Robert Rue Parsonage, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-291.
[17]Joseph E. Kauffman, quoted in Edgar M. Carlson, *The Future of Church Related Higher Education*, Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1977.
[18]Parker J. Palmer, "Turnings: Some Notes on Conversion," 1977, mimeographed, p. 6.
[19]Merrimon Cuniggim, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-81.
[20]Parker J. Palmer, *A Place Called Community*, Wallingford, PA: Pendle Hill Publications, April, 1977, pp. 16-17.

Chapter 13

EFFECTIVE CHURCH-COLLEGE RELATIONSHIPS AND HOW THEY ARE MADE

Dan C. West

This is intended to suggest the following:

1. There are certain *constituent elements* which may be present in effective church-college relationships. It is clear that not all of the constituent elements which are enumerated here as examples must be present for an effective relationship. Nor can any minimal number be suggested. There are, however, certain components to a relationship which can be identified and used. The word "effective" is used advisedly to refer to a relationship which is appropriately successful when both the church body concerned and the college concerned believe it to be.

2. A number of *circumstances which are changing constantly may change church-college relationships.* These changing circumstances need to be taken into account when the effort is made to understand a church-college relationship and to plan for its continued effectiveness in the future.

3. It would seem to be helpful to suggest *what results are produced by an effective church-college relationship.* Again, not all of the results mentioned will necessarily flow from every relationship, nor will any minimum number of results be suggested. What will be suggested is that unless some of these results or others like them are produced by the relationship, the relationship is probably foundering or ineffective.

4. The attempt will be made to suggest *ways in which church-college relationships can be built for the future.* Based on an understanding of the kinds of constituent elements it takes to build a relationship, taking seriously the changing circumstances in which churches and colleges find themselves and which may change the nature of their relationship to each other, and agreeing that there must be certain expectations and certain results produced by these relationships, how can concerned persons envision, plan and build an effective church-college relationship?

I. The Constituent Elements of Church College Relationships

Although there is no irreducible list of ingredients for an effective church-college relationship, there are certain constituent elements

which can be observed in effective church-college relationships now existing. These suggest that some of the following elements are going to be present in all church-college relationships which are "effective" (both parties involved in the relationship agree that it is one of mutual benefit) and "successful" (it helps both college and church to accomplish their purposes).

A. A constituent element which is sometimes overlooked is that of a *common history*. Colleges were often founded during the formative stages of development of the church groups to which they are now related. Frequently they were founded because of some widely agreed upon need which the church had to train clergy or to establish its identity and its distinction from other church groups. Churches and colleges have developed side by side in many instances, and they have struggled with the same problems or involved themselves in the problems of each other. Leaders of colleges and churches have frequently been interchangeable. Colleges have prepared generations of persons for church leadership, both clergy and lay; churches have motivated generations of people to become trustees, students, and benefactors. Overall, both organizations may have shared traditions, customs, attitudes, and ethnic, racial, or cultural experiences through the years. Such common history can be a strong and influential ingredient in effective church-college relationships.

B. There might be *agreement on the part of both church and college that there are theological answers to the basic human questions.* This is not always the case in effective relationships. A college might decide for a variety of reasons that it does not wish to subscribe to this proposition. We can assume that all churches do, however, and that many colleges do as well. If there is agreement on this point, it can be an important reason for church and college to remain in relationship. Without formally requesting it, the church will benefit from the thinking, studying, and teaching of certain members of the faculty of a college who concern themselves frequently with the matter of raising theological quesions and seeking theological answers to these questions. Just as likely, these same faculty members will pay close attention to the teachings and changing consensus of the church on these same issues. A common struggle for answers to such questions as life and death, meaning, good and evil can be strong cement for a relationship of interdependence.

There is mounting evidence to support the notion that independent, church-related colleges may be more free to grapple with the nature of truth, more open to a variety of ideas, and more conducive to the dis-

cussion of unpopular or minority viewpoints than other types of more secular institutions of higher learning. If this is true, church-related colleges are not only important to the protection of academic freedom, but they also provide environments where the basic human questions can be pursued with relatively greater freedom from prejudice and faddish bases.

C. A *respect for the different roles and responsibilities of the other group* can be another important element. There are differences between the purposes and the methods of a college compared to those of a church. These differences are not always recognized. Sometimes they are treated as minimal differences on purpose. If they are recognized as important, however, and if there is appreciation for the different kind of work each group engages in, this can help avoid misunderstanding and confusion about the activity or the operative principles of the other group. It can also avoid the questioning of motives or assumptions about competition and duplication of effort, or judgments about the ineffective use of resources.

D. A *desire among both groups to work together* and to help each other may seem too elemental to mention. Nevertheless, if both the church and the college do not want to be related to each other, there is not much point in continuing the discussion. More than a simple or vague desire to be related, the constituent element of what Cuninggim calls "conscious intention" might also include a commitment within both groups to work together and to help each other. This can take a number of forms, of course. If there is an awareness on the part of the college that it needs the church (or vice versa), or if there is an awareness on the part of each group that circumstances in the society or issues which confront either group are of concern to both groups, there could be a commitment to working together to solve common problems and to confront common issues.

E. *Close personal relationships between leaders in each group* can be as important as any other element in an effective church-college relationship. Leaders of the church and leaders of the college can do business together on the basis of compatible personalities or mutual respect and affection or common agreement that they need to work with each other. Much can occur to strengthen the relationship which will not happen otherwise. Many relationships with elaborate official channels and mechanisms for supporting the relationship founder because of the inability of key leaders to work with each other. Just as importantly, many relationships prosper without real structure or formal communications etiquette simply because key leaders in each group are in close

touch and work well with each other. Questions of dependability and vulnerability in the case of the latter have to be taken seriously. On the other hand, not enough seriousness has been given in many denominations, perhaps, to the importance of the former.

F. If there is *a sense of ownership on the part of key persons in each group* toward the other group, this is important. The word "ownership" here is used in a broad way. It can mean control. It can also mean involvement, being part of the important decisions of the other group, contributing money, referring students, being consulted, and being asked for suggestions when important changes are about to occur within the other group. In all the various ways in which people feel part of something, persons in either church or college can feel part of the other group. To describe this area is difficult and should not be done too specifically since we are dealing with feelings, attitudes, and that which may be more apparent than substantive. How does one feel a part of an organization or group? Being cultivated, visited, communicated with by mail or telephone, solicited, recruited, sought after for advice, or honored are a few of the ways. Or, one feels involved by volunteering time, giving money, offering counsel, and entering into friendships with persons closely associated with the group. A sense of ownership or involvement on the part of persons in both groups toward the other group can be very important.

G. Another ingredient for effective relationships might be *formal channels for developing concepts, policies, and understandings and for changing these.* An office or department of higher education in a denominational structure, a church judicatory as a forum for discussion, and the use of a board of trustees or a board of visitors as a forum for this purpose are but the most obvious channels of communication between church and college. In addition, the development of concepts or policies or understandings which form a part of the relationship between the two groups can and does occur informally and in a spontaneous or unstructured way. This may be the only way it happens in some relationships. On the other hand, there can be certain formal, official ways in which discussion, evaluation, speculation, planning, and confrontation of issues occur. Official channels for communication may be used more or less frequently and may be more or less effective, but an agreement between college and church on such a channel in itself can be an important element in the relationship. To whatever extent either a college or a church gives thought to the best ways for discussing issues which develop in church-college relationships, this is evidence of a concern for developing channels of communication. The use of a church or

a college publication, mailing out questionnaires, the formation of advisory committees, or other such ad hoc means of talking with each other are further examples of the establishment of channels to provide interchange between the two groups.

H. Following on the mention of some means of talking with each other, another constituent element comes to mind. There might be *a mechanism for agreements and making decisions* on issues, questions, or problems affecting church-college relationships. Does the constituent assembly or highest policymaking body of the church make such decisions by majority vote? Are they mutually agreed upon by a college's trustees and some corresponding church group with authority to act for the church? In some relationships, of course, there is no such mechanism. Decisions are made unilaterally and either accepted or rejected by the other group. In some relationships, on the other hand, there is a formal, recognized way of agreeing upon new policies or new ways of doing business with each other.

I. Some amount of *money being given by the church to the college group* can be another important element of the relationship. Effective relationships can exist without this, but most commonly this is not the case. Commitment and interest often follow the investment of money in anything. Even when financial investment by a church in a college is minimal or so small as to be a token, there seems to be an important aspect of visibility and inclusion of the college in the church's thinking and planning which is lost without it. It is usual today for most colleges, and some churches too, to decry the sagging amount of church contributions to the costs of running colleges and to point to the diminishing percentage of a college's budget which is contributed by one church group or another. This is a serious problem in many instances. In other instances the patterns of church support of colleges have changed dramatically, and significant amounts of money which often comprise substantial percentages of college's financial needs are given by individual church members rather than by congregations or associations of churches.

J. An understanding of the way in which *various groups of persons can provide links between the two groups* and the creative use of these groups of persons might be an element of relationship. To what extent do groups of students, faculty, or individual church members live and work in both groups? To what extent do they carry with them into the thinking, planning, and activity of either church or college the influences of the other group? How well does the church understand the way colleges train and mold students who then become leaders and workers

in the church? How well does the college understand the way in which the church has molded the thinking of members of its faculty and staff and board of trustees who grew up under the influence of the church? If there is an awareness that boards of trustees and church judicatories, whether they be districts or synods or national assemblies or whatever, are not the only groups which provide a forum for discussing issues and making decisions which form part of the church-college relationship, and if there is an understanding of how individual church members and students and faculty and individual trustees are often as influential as these bodies in shaping the relationship, much good can occur. The mere awareness that individuals can be as important as official groups and formal processes can do much to insure effective church-college relationships.

K. A *common concern about the future* can also be a cementing element. The future of the church, the future of the college, and the future of our society can be areas of concern which occupy the thinking of both church and college. If this is the case, both groups are naturally drawn together. Out of an awareness that they share the same future, church and college can worry, plan, envision, and hope together in such a way that they feel a part of each other.

II. The Changing Circumstances of Churches and Colleges

A number of circumstances are changing very quickly in this country today. Many of these changes will affect the relationships between churches and colleges. A long list of such changes could be cited here, but a few illustrations will suffice to illustrate the importance of recognizing that, unless relationships are allowed to evolve, they may be placed under severe stress by changed conditions from those in which the relationships were originally formed. Indeed, these changes may compel colleges and churches to examine anew and revise existing relationships.

The *growth of government* is a good one to mention first. The influence or, in many instances, the direct control of the federal government has become more and more pervasive. While this is more apparent in the operation of colleges than in churches at this particular time, there is no guarantee that churches will not be affected in the future. Indeed, there are strong indications that the churches may be next as a sector of American society which could be regulated, evaluated, challenged, taxed, or otherwise confronted by one federal agency or another. At the same time, state governments grow apace in the extent of their

operations and in their influence over most sectors of our lives. Local government, too, is growing. As federal and state government become more extensive, they depend more and more on local government for coordinating functions. All the while, citizens are demanding more services from all levels of government, and this raises the need for additional tax revenues. This in turn puts pressure on the tax structure and may mean the eventual elimination of many types of tax deductible gifts which have been the lifeblood of most colleges and churches. This is but one scenario which can be played out as government grows. Another is suggested by a statement of the United Church of Christ which said, "We have turned increasingly to the government to provide educational opportunity – while more and more ascribing ultimate authority and meaning to that government." Other examples could be cited.

If the society grows more secular or if church participation compared with church membership declines, the churches could find themselves more and more part of *a religious and cultural minority in this country*. At the same time, if government grows more pervasive and if the influence of independent higher education declines, church-related colleges will find themselves in a smaller minority than they are now. If government participation in all aspects of American life continues to grow at the cost of private initiative and voluntary support of private organizations, both churches and church-related colleges could find their influence diminished and their activity greatly curtailed compared to what it is now.

If resources become more scarce because of diminishing reserves or the inability of this country to import resources from other countries at the same rate as the present, this could greatly affect colleges in particular and churches too. Diminishing supplies of gasoline, heating fuel, or water, for example, can curtail the operation of church-related colleges. Should gasoline become a rationed commodity or should the price of gasoline be driven up so high as to make it too precious for colleges to use, then fund-raising, student recruitment, and faculty travel would all be seriously reduced with drastic consequences.

Numerous *changes in public policy* are occurring and will occur in the future. Public policy changes have already affected church-related colleges to an extent that is beginning to attract the notice of churches as well as college administrators and trustees. It will probably take concerted, well-coordinated, and highly effective joint action by interest groups formed of representatives from both colleges and churches to influence the shape of public policy in the years to come so that it will

not be so harmful to both as to make it impossible for them to function. As church-related colleges continue to graduate a minority of the baccalaureate degree winners in this country, the ranks of legislators who were educated in church-related colleges will grow smaller and smaller. What does the future hold for colleges and churches whose influence is diminished in the halls of legislative bodies?

Lawsuits and *court decisions* are being considered weekly which affect the future of both churches and church-related colleges. Until recently there has been little understanding or concern about how these decisions can change the ways both groups are accustomed to doing their work. From an environment in which church-related colleges have been relatively free to operate subject only to their own boards of trustees, we may find ourselves confronted with lawsuits challenging even the most routine decisions.

At the moment, there is an apparent lowering of expectations on the part of the general populace of this country *for the services of educational institutions*, especially the type of educational institution most church-related colleges represent. The demand for a college degree has declined. The importance of college training as it is traditionally understood is being questioned. There are more alternatives to church-related colleges today than ever before. It is more difficult to make the case for liberal arts education, a characteristic feature of many church-related colleges. There are more commuter students than resident students and this stands in contrast to the largely residential nature of many church-related colleges. Most educational institutions are more heterogeneous; admissions requirements are either lower than in the past or non-existent. This contrasts with many church-related colleges whose studnet enrollments are homogeneous and whose admissions standards still exclude many persons.

At this time our nation is afflicted with an *inflation* rate which is of greater concern to more people in the general population than any other single issue. It is affecting both churches and church-related colleges in the most agonizing ways. If inflation continues at its present rate, it will become difficult to maintain physical plants, retain qualified faculty and staff, provide student financial aid sufficient to keep enrollments at cost effective levels, and avoid invading precious endowments.

Many aspects of *the tax structure* in this country are under scrutiny today. Federal taxes and state taxes, not to mention local taxes, are desperately needed to pay for burgeoning government on all levels. There is an assumption which is operative in the minds of many tax

planners and other public officials that tax revenues are the property of the government which citizens do not pay only if they can find some legitimate exception to the law requiring them to do so or if they defraud the government. The attitude of government officials seems to be that there are no legitimate tax deductions or reasons for not paying taxes. There are only "tax loopholes" and "tax shelters." There is an assumption that all money belongs to the government except that which is allowed to remain with the people. As this way of conducting government continues, the pressure will increase to change the tax system in order to provide for the growing cost of government. This will change traditional patterns of private philanthropy. It will increase the burden on churches and church-related colleges to provide more take-home pay and nontaxable compensation or fringe benefits for employees who will be saddled with higher and higher taxes. It may mean that churches and church-related colleges will be required to pay taxes they have never contemplated having to pay in the past.

III. Results of Effective Church-College Relationships

In addition to understanding the constituent elements of church-college relationships and the changing circumstances which these relationships must sustain, one must also consider what is expected as the result of a relationship.

If "effective" church-college relationships are understood to be those which are considered successful by both groups who are party to the relationship, it could be important to understand how a relationship could come to be called effective. Perhaps only one result would be enough to cause persons in each group to consider their relationship effective. Perhaps there might be a long list of results which would be either expected or realized.

If the church body is going through a period of self-examination and change in its purpose or its method of doing its work, the *colleges might be expected to help the church redefine itself*. Some churches are experiencing this kind of flux today. It might be reasonable for them to expect colleges related to them to help with the formation of new theologies, new creedal statements, new church government structures, or new priorities for mission on the part of the church.

Another result of an effective church-college relationship might be for persons in the church to *understand the colleges as arenas where church people can act out their discipleship*. An expected result might be for a member of a church to take the concerns and obligations of

his or her church membership on to a church-related college campus as a student, trustee, teacher, or staff person and there find ways to practically live out his or her discipleship to Christ. In just the same way as church members are expected to act out their discipleship in politics, in business affairs, in the arts, and in every other aspect of our societal life, church members could be understood to represent the church and its Lord in this important arena.

Another result might be for the colleges to consciously link their fortunes with that of the churches in *maintaining a viable "third sector" of our society* based on private voluntary effort and private resources. The importance of maintaining an independent sector within the higher education system might be broadened to include the importance of maintaining a strong private sector of the society. This would stand in distinction to large areas of our societal life today which are either controlled by or heavily influenced by government, if not financed by government. The importance of protecting the precious resource of individual initiative and a sense of caring in the face of growing dependence on government to provide services of all types and the tendency to look more and more to government for the solution of all problems grows more critical yearly. The churches and the colleges both have much at stake here.

Still another result of an effective church-college relationship might be that *each group will protect the other's freedom and independence from government control or interference*. Each will see an improper invasion of the other's independence as a threat to itself and staunchly insist that such interference be challenged and rebuffed. Each will be an advocate for the other as well as for themselves in this regard.

A result of effective church-college relationships might be the *development of a consensus on the characteristics of a church-related college*. If there can be an agreement on the part of both church and college about what a college should be like to be considered church-related by both groups, little time and few resources will be wasted on arguments and misunderstandings over this. In more positive terms, both groups will be free to decide for themselves whether and how they choose to be related to the other if the criteria for church-relatedness are clear.

Another result might be that both church and college will take into account and *plan for the future*. They will think about their future as a college or as a church, and they will think about their future together. They will think seriously about the changes which are occurring and try to project the changes which are still ahead. They will think about ways

to protect their relationship with each other and ways to change it and adapt it as inevitable changes occur. And they will think about how to confront new issues and unexpected changes together.

The *colleges will understand themselves, in part, as places where training can occur for persons who will become leaders in the church* as well as leaders in the larger society. They will think about the ways in which their curricula prepare students for leadership in the church. They may choose to provide experiences for students which are specifically designed to help them with church leadership responsibility, or they may choose to prepare students for their role more indirectly and subtly. In whatever way is appropriate for them, they will take seriously their role as preparers of persons for church leadership. They might also think about how they train students to assume leadership positions in college or church in order to maintain the effectiveness of the church-college relationship.

Finally, an effective church-college relationship might produce *churches and colleges which look upon each other more as colleagues* than as adversaries, allies instead of competitors. An effective church-college relationship might result in less distance between the two groups. It might result in each thinking of the other as an allied enterprise instead of a separate activity coexisting side by side with a minimum of interference in each other's affairs. There may come to be a greater understanding of the close affinity of religion for education and vice versa. There may even come an understanding of religion's dependence on intellectual inquiry as it is practiced by church-related colleges and of a college's dependence on humane values and theological affirmations as these are practiced by the churches.

IV. Church-College Relationships for the Future

As the constituent elements of church-college relationships are better understood and as changing circumstances in our society bring pressure to bear on churches and church-related colleges to reexamine their relationship, the desired results of church-college relationships may change. When this happens, it will be necessary to modify the relationship or perhaps reconstruct it or, in unusual circumstances, to replace it with an entirely new relationship. When this decision is made, both church and college need ways to build effective church-college relationships for the future. What follows is not necessarily a prescription for this, certainly not a plan which must be followed in its entirety or even in the same sequence as it is suggested here. Rather, this is a list of actions

which could be taken and issues which could be addressed that could lead to the establishment of an effective relationship or the changing of an existing relationship to make it more effective.

It is important for both the church and the college to consciously and formally *decide to be purposeful about the relationship*. Some formal occasion or method of deciding to begin or continue or change the relationship ought to take place. In whatever form is appropriate, whether it be the signing of a piece of paper or the taking of a vote or the publishing of a document in a publication, this should occur.

Both church and college should *decide which constituent elements* (such as those discussed in the first section of this paper) should be understood to be a part of the relationship. If the two groups are going to take their common history seriously and work at developing formal channels for discussing common policies and use students and faculty as well as trustees and church officials as channels through which to relate the two groups to each other, then these elements in the relationship should be identified, described, and held up as parts of the working arrangement.

Each participant in the relationship should be defined in a way that is understandable and acceptable to both groups. A conscientious effort should be made to define the church body involved. However difficult this may seem to be, it is a necessary exercise. It should be defined not only in theological terms, important as that obviously is, but also in sociological and political and practical terms. Is the "church" the denomination, a middle judicatory, church executives, local church congregations, individual church members, some combination of these, or all of these? Is the "church" to be thought of as an organization, as a mission, as a set of priorities, as a political entity, or as a loose association of individuals? Such questions as these, if confronted squarely and if answered with clarity in a way acceptable to both groups, can be very important for the future of the relationship. Understanding colleges in a similar way is also important. It is important to get these definitions as clearly understood as possible at the outset and then work to keep them clear in the minds of persons as the relationship continues in order to avoid frustration, disappointment, and confusion.

In any papers or policies or other documents used to establish the relationship, all *terms* subject to different interpretation or misinterpretation by the church community or the academic community *should be carefully defined*. Words such as "policy" or "governance" or "authority" should be defined so that there is clarity about their meaning in these documents.

Responsibility for the college must be fixed. Is this placed with the board of trustees, with some group within the church, or where? Who is legally liable? Who has operational control? Who holds title? Who owes the debt? Who owns all assets?

The *relationship might be described in a formal way* as it appears in the standing rules of a church body or the by-laws of a board of trustees. There might be a constituting document of some type which gives a formal structure to the relationship and provides a checkpoint against which to measure how effectively the relationship is being implemented.

The *description of the relationship* which is agreed upon by both parties might be *used to test acceptance and understanding* of this relationship among constituents of both the college and the church. Asking people to read the description and comment on it would be a way of testing its validity and determining whether it is understandable enough to people in both groups so that it is going to be implemented.

It might be important to *agree* ahead of time *on ways to change the relationship* as the demand for change might occur in the future. A formal mechanism might be established for this purpose. If there is to be an agreement that, when either party believes the relationship is not working any longer, that party has some means, formal or informal, of insisting on a re-examination of the relationship, then that should be settled at the outset. If there is to be a time of testing a new relationship or a revised one to see if it will work, perhaps it would be helpful to set a date in the future when the evaluation will, in fact, end.

Both church and college should agree to work at *communicating the nature of the relationship to constituents of both groups*. This can occur in many ways, and it will happen naturally if the relationship is a vital one. A conscious decision to use artificial means of communicating might, however, be very beneficial. This will illustrate the seriousness of each group's commitment to the other in trying to make the relationship work. It will cause the relationship to be scrutinized by more people. It will result in changes and revisions which can be thought of as improvements.

Finally, the church and the college should resolve to *use the relationship to do their own work* and to help each other do their work. If care has been taken in preparing the relationship and understanding it and communicating it, then the relationship should be a means whereby both groups can do their work more effectively than they could without it. It should be the primary means by which each group can help the other and through which together they can solve problems and confront issues which pose common threats to both.

SOURCES

A College-Related Church -- United Methodist Perspectives. Nashville: National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education, 1976.

McKeever, Porter, "The Third Sector," An address given to the Arkansas Community Foundation, December 4, 1978.

McLean, Malcolm, et. al., "A Unique Role in a Unique Time," A booklet drawn from a special edition of the *Journal of Current Social Issues*. New York: Council for Higher Education, United Church of Christ, 1977.

Novak, Robert D., "What's Happening Out There?" *Public Opinion*, Sept /Oct., 1978, pp. 2-9.

"The Basis for Partnership Between Church and College," a statement of the Lutheran Church in America adopted by its Eighth Biennial Convention. New York: Division for Mission in North America, LCA, 1976.

Parsonage, Robert Rue, ed., *Church-Related Higher Education.* Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1978.

West, Dan C. ed., "Methods for Officially Relating to Colleges of the Church." Unpublished paper prepared by The Association of Presbyterian Colleges for the General Assembly Task Force on Higher Education of the Presbyterian Church, U.S. September, 1978.

"Writing Covenants Between Church Bodies and Institutions" A Monograph of the Center for Program and Institutional Renewal at Austin College, Sherman, Texas, 1978.

Chapter 14

COLLEGE RELATIONSHIPS IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA: A CASE STUDY

Richard Solberg

I. The Partnership Statement

The Lutheran Church in America (LCA), with 3,100,000 members, is one of the three major Lutheran denominations in North America. Its membership, organized into thirty-three geographical synods, is spread across the entire continent, with heaviest concentration in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and the upper midwestern states. It maintains relationships to twenty-two colleges and universities, the oldest of which was established in 1832.

These institutions are independently governed, their boards of trustees in most cases elected by synods. Though varying in size, from 500-2500 students, in locations from New York to California and South Carolina to Canada, differing substantially in admissions standards, academic strength, and cost, these colleges are nevertheless held together by some very substantial bonds, both in character and in spirit. All of them are essentially undergraduate liberal arts institutions, offering major concentrations in the traditional areas of human knowledge, together with significant emphases upon professional and pre-professional studies. All of them are small institutions, offering the opportunity for closer personal relationships between students and faculty. All of them have professed relationships to the Lutheran Church in America and to one or more of its synods. The nature of these relationships varies, but in an age of secularization, the professed intent of these colleges to maintain and cultivate their church-relatedness constitutes a hallmark of notable significance.

Following the close of World War II, the colleges of the LCA experienced the same stresses and strains to which all of American higher education was subjected. They felt the effects of the GI Bill, the launching of Sputnik, the impact of federal largesse, both for student tuition and for capital construction, the trauma of the Vietnam War, and the violent upheavals of the 1960s. And when the public reaction set in, in the early 1970s, LCA colleges shared in the retrenchments necessitated by cutbacks in government grants and the declining number of student applicants, and in the general loss of public confidence in

the entire American educational system.

Not long thereafter, in 1972, the presidents of the LCA colleges turned to the church's Board of College Education for assistance in meeting these problems and in strengthening church ties which had also suffered during the savage 1960s. The Board responded with financial support to a project implemented in three phases, each directed toward one of the major concerns cited by the presidents.

For the strengthening of student recruitment and for the advancement of fund-raising activities, technical assistance programs were made available to the colleges.

To achieve a renewed focus on the church-relatedness of the colleges, the project undertook the preparation of a theologically based rationale for the involvement of the LCA in college education.

Such a document was intended to stimulate discussion and assist in clarifying and reaffirming the purpose of the colleges in relation to the mission of the church. It would be especially useful as a tool for the periodic review of the covenant agreements which the colleges and their supporting synods had adopted in 1970 and the years following.

The rationale statement, entitled "The Basis for Partnership Between Church and College," was prepared by a committee of ten persons, representing the Council of the LCA Colleges and the Division for Mission in North America. The task extended over a two-year period. The completed document was brought before the biennial convention of the LCA in Boston and approved in July, 1976.

Although formally adopted by the church in convention, the Partnership Statement was not intended to issue the final and complete dictum of the church on college-church relationships. Nor was it intended to be proposed to faculties and trustees for adoption on behalf of their academic institutions. Rather, its declared purpose was "to offer material that may be used by the colleges internally," and "to make a contribution to the continuing study and debate about the purpose and potential in the relationship of the church and the college."

Indeed, if the basic thesis of the Partnership Statement is accepted – namely, that the church and the college are separate institutions, colleagues, but with distinctive basic purposes and functions – it would be inappropriate for a college, church-related or not, to adopt formal theological doctrinal statements.

The substance of the first major segment of the Statement is an attempt to answer the question: On what ground does the Lutheran Church in America base its involvement in college education? Appropriately, the church bases its response in the first instance upon its

theology, a theology which not only respects the dignity of the educational enterprise but also insists that it be conducted on the highest level of intellectual and moral integrity.

Essentially, the Partnership Statement finds its theological base in the recognition of the God-ordained validity of the "orders of creation," those natural and cultural structures which give form and purpose to individual and collective human life. God is the Lord of *all* Creation, and its ultimate governance and preservation are in His hands. He has made provision for the temporal guidance and care of human society through institutions such as the family, government, schools, hospitals, business and commerce, and the arts. Although these institutions are beset with human frailty and weakness, their purpose is nevertheless to advance and improve the human condition. They are a part of God's benevolent intent and design that all people should work together to tend His creation and care for one another. God is at work through persons and institutions, even those who may ignore or deny Him, to fulfill His purposes.

It is the teaching of the Christian faith that the human family has become estranged from God through pride, selfishness, and disobedience. For the redemption and salvation of this fallen family of His, God has revealed Himself through the incarnation, life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Those who are willing to receive His gift of grace and forgiveness through faith are restored to sonship with Him and are sustained in fellowship with all believers in the holy catholic church, through the ministry of Word and Sacrament.

The people of God, however, are not separated from the world in antiseptic isolation. On the contrary, they are called to a life of thankful service to God and their neighbors. It is therefore not proper for Christian people to seek to confine God's work and their own to some limited religious sphere. Although the church's primary task is to proclaim God's grace and forgiveness through Jesus Christ, God's people, individually and corporately, may also join forces with all persons of good will in efforts to achieve justice in all segments of society and to improve the quality of human life wherever possible.

Quite understandably, it will be necessary for the church, as a corporate body, to exercise wisdom and discretion in the development of its limited temporal resources. After making primary provision for the ministry of Word and Sacrament, which is its essential task, however, the church has historically (and with far-reaching benefit, especially to Western civilization) laid great and effective stress upon the two areas of healing and teaching, not only the teaching of religious doctrine, but

the full curricular spectrum: the arts, humanities, and sciences. It is especially to the propriety and *wisdom* of maintaining its role in this crucial service area of church-related education that the Partnership Statement addresses itself, often in eloquent terms, such as the following paragraph:

> This means that education in general, and the church-related college in particular, have an integrity and purpose grounded in the Creed's first Article, concerning Creation. The capacity to learn, to search into the secrets of nature and use its resources, to search into the mystery of the human and perceive our misery and grandeur, to search into the riddle of history and be stalkers of meaning, is possible because of God's goodness. The fact that sinners are not justified by knowledge or cultural refinement should not obscure the further fact that education is the gift of a loving Creator. Through it he would enhance and enrich people's lives. Through it he would inform, motivate and equip them to make human society what he intends it to be. Sound scholarship, careful research, and effective teaching do him honor and serve his cause.
>
> This perception of education, grounded in the theology of the Lutheran church, establishes the freedom and significance of educational institutions. It affirms the college as a college, devoted to its primary task, blending together the differing talents and convictions of many persons.

According to this credo, then, the LCA does not support colleges as evangelistic centers or parochial schools. It sees its colleges as educational institutions, related to but distinct from the church, with primary purposes rooted in an honest desire to aid young people to become more sensitive and competent citizens, who will seek to promote justice and the common good. The Lutheran Church in America sees this kind of service to the world, rendered by its colleges, as one of the most critical in our society today, in the face of deteriorating public morals and ethical standards.

If this were the only reason for the church to operate its colleges in today's world, it would be a sufficient one, for in so doing, the church is being faithful to its own responsibilities to share in the quest for justice and well being for the world and the people who dwell within it, and to the integrity of the educational process as one of God's precious gifts to the human family. As the Partnership Statement puts it, the church and the college, although entrusted with different basic tasks,

here "converge on a common concern," the enhancement of the quality of life enjoyed by the human family and the care given to God's creation.

Because of the great importance attached to college education in our society, because the college works with and has access to persons who can and will do much to shape the character, inform the mind, establish the policies, and set the values of society as a whole, it affords the church which works in partnership with it a potentially powerful means to exercise its prophetic concern that the structures and forces of society become wiser, more just, and more compassionate. Whether this common concern is effectively dealt with depends upon the wisdom, the imagination, and the conviction of both institutions.

It is a truism to say that the colleges and universities of our land provide our future leaders. It is an assertion of significant moment that the Lutheran Church in America enjoys a working partnership with twenty-two of these institutions where more than 25,000 young men and women are at work preparing themselves for such roles of leadership. Each spring about 6000 of them are graduated into the social structure and into a wide variety of geographical locations and professions. Each fall another 8000 young people enter to begin their preparation!

The most compelling reason for the Lutheran Church's support of colleges is the opportunity to bear substantive witness to and to implement the doctrine of Christian vocation. The preparation of men and women motivated to be responsible citizens in the variety of professions and occupations necessary to society's well-being is an unparalleled service both for God and His world. Through such support the church makes it very clear that it takes seriously its profession that the baptismal calling of the Christian may be as well expressed in a career of business or law or politics as in the performance of religious exercises or even deeds of mercy.

Of course, it is expected that there be some other distinguishing marks of a church-related college. The basic standards upon which the LCA has extended official recognition to its colleges as church-related include: (1) affirmation in its official documents of its relationship to the LCA; (2) affirmation of an institutional commitment to Christian life and learning; (3) accreditation by a regional accrediting agency; and (4) a guarantee of academic freedom for students, faculty, and administrators.

In addition, the college is expected to provide regular opportunities for Christian worship as part of the college program; a chaplain whose primary concern is a pastoral ministry; a competent program of courses

in religion; opportunities for Christian service; and freedom for Christian witness by faculty, students, and administrators.

The Partnership Statement also lays stress upon the dialogue which should occur on the college campus, in which theology, with its understanding of God's Word, and other disciplines, with their understanding of God's world, probe and illuminate each other. Such dialogue can enrich both the college and the church.

The two institutions, as partners, also offer each other a wealth of resources. The church provides the college with a constituency from which it can obtain students, faculty, administrators, trustees, and financial support. The college provides the church with a pool of talented and trained persons in many fields. It is true even today that of the 8000 clergy of the LCA, 66% are graduates of Lutheran colleges. Lay leadership in both congregational and church-wide ministries also continues to draw heavily on church-college graduates.

During the study and discussion which accompanied the preparation of the Partnership Statement, several basic questions were asked time and time again: Are *these really* the reasons why the Lutheran Church in America and its predecessor bodies have maintained colleges since 1832? Are these the *right* reasons? Have our people loved and supported their colleges for the *wrong* reasons? And, most basic of all: Do we *still feel* that, for whatever reasons, these colleges are an important aspect of the church's mission and witness?

The Partnership Statement clearly affirms the desire of the Lutheran Church in America to be linked significantly with colleges and universities which, in turn, desire a significant link with the church. This affirmation is rooted in the conviction that a vital relationship of this kind can greatly enhance the present and future ministries of both church and college.

Whether this relationship is indeed still a healthy one, how it is presently understood and valued among the constituencies of the college and the church, and whether these people feel that it should be maintained in the future were questions which the study commission could not answer by itself.

Consequently, the decision was made to direct those questions to the people who *could* answer them: namely, the constituencies. In the full awareness that a straightforward, non-defensive survey might yield evidences of the erosion of some cherished images of the colleges as institutions of the church, a comprehensive church-wide survey of the major constituency groups of all the colleges related to the LCA was commissioned.

II. The Survey of Images and Expectations

During the late summer and early autumn of 1975, the Lutheran Church in America and its Council of Colleges commissioned a national survey of the images and expectations of its colleges, as held by the major constituencies of each of the eighteen colleges.

More than 7000 persons across the continent responded to a questionnaire of thirty-six pages probing the issues basic to college-church relationships. The objectives of the study were stated as follows:

1. To heighten the sense of church-relatedness within the colleges and universities of the LCA.
2. To clarify for members of supporting constituencies the importance of and the need for church-related colleges.
3. To improve the quality of communication and interaction between colleges and their supporting constituencies.
4. To increase the effectiveness of specific college programs of outreach, such as student recruitment, financial support, and public relations.

Dr. Merton P. Strommen, president of Search Institute in Minneapolis, directed the research process, dividing it into three distinct stages: (1) the development of the survey instrument, (2) the administration of the survey, and (3) the analysis and reporting of survey data.

Stage one began in February, 1975, with a search of the literature, identifying current major issues and questions in the field of church-related higher education and confirming the fact that no previous study, comparable in nature and scope, had thus far been undertaken by church-related colleges and their constituencies.

Representatives of twelve constituent groups were then interviewed on seven LCA campuses (Upsala, California Lutheran, Roanoke, Susquehanna, Wittenberg, Bethany, and Muhlenberg) in order to identify the range of comments people give when probed about the expectations and images they hold concerning their college. All interviews were taped and later transcribed into statements for classification. These hundreds of statements, classified into categories, provided both a guide and a resource for determining what questionnaire items were needed.

Items developed from this resource were then subjected during the spring of 1975 to a process of screening and testing in which eighteen college presidents, their associates, members of constituent groups on

several campuses, consultants, and the advisory council to the project were involved. The result was a questionnaire of 270 items, derived through a careful process involving several hundred people throughout the nation. These items represented the universe of statements one could expect to hear from college constituencies regarding college goals, college-church relationships, faculty, administrators, campus religious life, and policies governing student life.

As the second stage began, procedures were devised for selecting random samples and securing data from twelve selected constituencies from which representatives had been selected in stage one to provide material for the building of the questionnaire. They were (1) senior students, (2) freshman students, (3) faculty, (4) administrative leaders, (5) trustees, (6) synod executive boards, (7) community citizens, (8) alumni, (9) parents of freshmen, (10) parents of seniors, (11) pastors of LCA congregations, and (12) lay members of congregations.

Study Directors, appointed by the president of each college, handled the administration of the survey for their own colleges. They selected samples of each constituency group, made contact with those whose names were drawn, and sought their participation, using precisely defined procedures, identical for all eighteen colleges. Samples of larger constituencies – such as synod pastors and congregations, students, and faculty – were taken in accordance with standard randomizing procedures. The full membership of two smaller groups, synod executive boards and college trustees, was invited to participate. A total of 7250 persons completed the questionnaire during August and September, 1975, with an average time expenditure of approximately one hour and fifteen minutes. In order to be tabulated in the survey, at least 80% of the questions had to be answered. A total of 6728 persons were thus effectively included in the data analysis.

Percentages of participation by persons drawn into each of the national samples varied but were generally well above averages for such surveys. The sampling of college administrative leadership produced a response of 83%; college faculties, 76%; LCA pastors, 74%; college freshmen, 61%; college seniors, 50%; parents of freshmen, 48%; parents of seniors, 47%; and alumni, 41%. Sixty-eight percent of the entire membership of college trustee boards responded, and 58% of all members of synod executive boards.

The final stage of the research project was the analysis and reporting of the data. Questionnaire returns were sent directly to the Search Institute, either by the Study Directors in cases of group administration, or by individuals if handled by mail. With the assistance of highly

sophisticated computer programming, the data were organized in relation to concepts which emerged as the major concerns among the constituencies of the LCA colleges. Analysis of the responses of each constituent group provided very significant reflections of their perceptions of the character and practices of these colleges as church-related institutions. The major areas of analysis were (1) Institutional Goals, (2) The Role of College Trustees and Administrators, (3) Campus Religious Programs, (4) Values for Responsible Citizenship, (5) The Church and the Faculty, and (6) The Future of College-Church Relationships.

Before examining the responses of constituents to each of these six areas of concern, one may find it useful to make a general assessment of the direction or flavor of the outcomes of the full survey. Were the outcomes encouraging? Discouraging? Sobering? The following general observations, each of which finds substantial documentation in the survey data, suggest that there is room for all of these reactions.

1. There was a strong affirmation of the high regard in which LCA colleges are held by their constituencies.
2. The colleges were viewed as providing superior academic training.
3. There was a strong sense that the colleges are an important channel for the fulfillment of the church's mission.
4. There was among the congregations of the LCA a serious lack of knowledge and awareness of the programs and the contributions of the colleges of the church.

A. Institutional Goals

Probably the most basic question posed to the constituencies was that dealing with *institutional goals*. Any assessment of an institution will depend on what a person believes the purpose of that institution to be. Responses in this area of concern tended to group themselves around six main themes which were seen as the most important educational expectations: (1) Wholeness of Person, (2) Preparation for Life, (3) The Values of the Liberal Arts, (4) The Christian Perspective, (5) Sensitivity to Social Change, and (6) Religious Diversity and Dialogue.

Among the six major goals, the two which were most widely held by all constituents were Wholeness of Person and Preparation for Life. Four out of five regarded these as essential or very desirable goals. The Liberal Arts followed closely, with 75%, while only 59% saw either the Christian Perspective or Social Change as essential institutional goals.

These percentages, of course, reflect the combined views of all constituent groups. The expectations of students and parents differ in

many instances, as do those of faculty and congregational laity. There is quite general agreement among all groups, for example, on the goal of Wholeness of Person. When thinking of Preparation for Life, students are more likely to see this as job preparation, while pastors, alumni, parents, and senior students are less enthusiastic, and the congregational laity least of all. The strongest expectation of Christian Perspective as a college goal is found among the clergy, 88% of whom also believe all faculty should be professing Christians.

It is also fair to ask how the constituent groups see these expectations being met in the colleges. Faculty, administrators, and senior students were the least certain that the high goals of education for Wholeness of Person were being achieved among students. Their realism contrasted with the lofty assumptions of freshman students and parents, who may have been reflecting their exposure to the promotional literature of the college. Most other groups, however, registered satisfaction with the efforts of their colleges. A similar pattern prevailed with reference to the second major goal of Preparation for Life.

Persons or groups who set high goals are least likely to claim that their goals have been reached. This appears to be the case with the goals of the Liberal Arts. The failure of the colleges and their students to achieve the high goals of cultural appreciation, imaginative and analytical thinking, and intellectual curiosity remains a matter of deep concern, especially to faculty and administrators. Such dissatisfaction may actually be the mark of faculties which have not yielded to complacency or lethargy.

A similar conclusion might be ventured concerning the discrepancies reflected by the clergy with respect to their expectations of Christian Perspective as a college goal. Although their dissatisfaction is the highest of all groups, they are joined, to a lesser degree, by Lutheran faculty, administrative leaders, parents of seniors, and younger laity. Groups whose expectations are low, such as non-Lutheran faculty and alumni, feel that more is being done by the college in this regard than necessary.

It is also apparent from the survey data that those who are supportive of a religious perspective in the life and program of the college do not always agree theologically on the nature of that perspective. There are those who conceive of the college as an extension of the congregation, serving in an academic setting essentially the basic role of the church, namely, the proclamation of the gospel of God's redemptive grace through Jesus Christ for human salvation. For them the rationale for the church-related college is evangelism. Others see the college as an educational institution distinct in basic purpose from the church,

yet fulfilling its tasks of teaching, leading students into the mysteries of the created world, enhancing and enriching the lives of people, in the firm conviction that it is thereby also serving both God and society.

That both of these views are represented among the supporters of the college is clearly attested by the responses to one particular item in the questionnaire, which reads as follows:

> The college differs from the church in that its primary task is not redemption, but rather to focus on the truth about creation.

LCA clergy were almost equally divided on this question, 45% expressing agreement and 40% disagreement. Fourteen percent were uncertain.

B. The Role of College Trustees and Administrators

The second question concerning which the Survey provides some answers deals with the leadership of the colleges: What kind of policy-makers and managers do our colleges have? Or, more accurately stated, what kind of administrators and trustees do the college constituencies think we *ought* to have?

The highest expectations of Lutheran college administrators are that they should care about students and that they should communicate well with faculty. Ninety-two percent of all respondents listed these two qualities as absolutely essential or very desirable. Expertise in college administration, faculty recruitment, and fund-raising, and a concern for academic excellence were also highly rated but did not rival the two top expectations. Search committees and college executives responsible for administrative recruitment may do well to bear this in mind. In the judgment of most of the constituency groups, the college administrators measure up quite well to these expectations. Significantly, however, faculty and senior students register the largest degree of disparity between their expectations and their perceptions with respect to the qualities of competence and caring.

With respect to the religious commitment of college administrators, the very high expectations registered by pastors and synod board members, and to a lesser degree by the congregational laity, are accompanied by indications of disappointment on their part with the degree of commitment they have observed on the part of administrators. This seems most evident among the laity. The fact that the administrators themselves are, next to the trustees, the group most convinced that the church-related college is an important part of the church's mission, may

suggest that administrators should seek more effective ways to bear witness to these convictions within the congregations and among the clergy of their synods.

The boards of trustees of the eighteen LCA colleges are of special significance since they are, in effect, the corporate owners and policy-makers of the institutions. Of the 308 who responded to the survey, 78% were Lutherans; one-third had incomes over $40,000, and 60% held master's or doctor's degrees. While there is among them virtually unanimous recognition of their responsibility as policy-makers, more than one-third of them feel that they are not carrying out this responsibility effectively. One of their clearly expressed concerns deals with the processes of nomination and election. Less than half (47%) of the responding trustees felt that sufficient care was being exercised by the synods in carrying out the nominating process for college trustees.

In view of the heightened awareness of the importance of the corporate and fiduciary responsibilities of boards of trustees in both public and private institutions and the widespread attention being given by boards to the development of a fuller understanding of trusteeship, some of the self-perceptions of the LCA college board members should be carefully noted. Eighty-four percent of LCA college trustees see themselves as a bulwark for the support of academic freedom for faculty and students, and almost the same percentage feel that this ideal is being achieved at their colleges.

An equally high percentage (86%) places high priority on the understanding of the problems and potentials of a church-related college, but barely half of them feel that they as trustees do a good job in this area. A significant number (67%) felt they ought to be communicating the mission and concerns of the college to the church constituencies, but few (23%) indicated that this task was being done well. Ten percent did not know how it was being done.

Most felt a deep need for closer college-church relationships and for better communication with representative members of faculty and church.

There is obviously a vast and willing resource in the boards of trustees for improved college-church relations – a resource thus far largely undeveloped. There is no constituency group which reflects loyal support of their college as strongly as the trustees. They are the most eager of all groups for a religiously distinctive college where theological engagement and education for moral responsibility are taken seriously.

Trustees, however, tend to be rather uncritical. Despite the fact that most college presidents can recount their share of "war stories" about certain memorable exceptions they have known, trustees are generally

among the last to believe negative reports about the college, its faculty, or its programs. This tendency toward unrealism may actually constitute a problem in policy-making, especially when administrators or faculty are seeking support and understanding of some very real campus problems.

C. Campus Religious Programs

Let us turn our attention next to campus religious life and programs. Items in the survey instrument sought responses to questions concerning the college's commitment to a clear and attractive program of proclamation, worship, witness, and service; concerning the role and standing of religion departments; and concerning theological interaction with other disciplines of the curriculum.

Here, too, both expectations and perceptions were invited. No reluctance was evident among the constituencies in identifying expectations, but the percentages of persons who marked one or more "don't know" responses on each of the perception scales ranged from 57% to 75%. Such responses may reflect a modesty of judgment on the part of many persons not immediately in touch with the campuses, but they ought also to suggest to the colleges the need to give their religious programs more visibility, both on and off campus.

It should be no surprise that the formal religious life programs in our colleges receive quite favorable ratings among the expectations of most constituency groups. They expect campus religious services to be held; they want courses in the religious heritage and theology of the Lutheran tradition to be available; they expect a chaplain to be provided; and they want the Christian faith presented in an intellectually respectable fashion.

More notable, however, are the differences in attitudes among the various constituency groups. In spite of the alleged upsurge of religious interest among youth of today, students, whether freshmen or seniors, express least desire for the campus religious programs. Apparently it makes little difference whether the students are newcomers in college, transplanted directly out of our communities and parishes, or whether they have been exposed to the influences of the campus for three or four years. The college chaplain and the parish pastor seem to be waging the same unsuccessful battle against those social forces which tend to alienate today's young from the church. Perhaps it is only natural that parish pastors project some of their own unrealized expectations into the college scene, and that they express their disappoint-

ment that the college chaplains are equally unsuccessful in enlisting their young people in the religious programs of the college.

The presence and vitality of theological dialogue are much more sophisticated expectations than those of the frequency and visibility of chapel services or the availability of a chaplain on campus. They deal with curriculum, campus conversation, and the ability and willingness of many persons to articulate the relationships between theology and other disciplines. Some theological literacy on the part of the faculty and staff is requisite for effective fulfillment of this expectation.

Those most eager for such theological engagement are administrative leaders, Lutheran faculty, pastors, and trustees. Students, parents, and congregational laity are least interested. Whether expectations are high or low, however, none of the groups perceives that the engagement is being effectively carried out.

D. Values for Responsible Citizenship

Among the roles of the church-related college which are singled out by the LCA Partnership Statement as of special significance is that of fostering responsible citizenship. Citizenship in this context is broadly understood as the fulfillment of all of life's obligations, including those related to occupation or profession, in accord with high ethical standards and with a sense of interdependence and human compassion. This concern is seen to be of particular importance in a society which is divided and uncertain about its values and future.

Our survey sought to ascertain how widespread among college constituencies is this expectation that colleges affirm a value stance and educate for moral responsibility, and to what degree campus life provides the setting which fosters responsible living and concern for others.

The data from respondents indicate that high priority is given by most college constituencies to education for moral responsibility. Most would affirm the position taken by the Partnership Statement and would expect the college to do the same. Not only should the college affirm such a stance, but it should also make it clear what conduct is expected at the college.

Although all groups rated these goals very highly, trustees, administrators, and parents showed greatest interest, with parents evidently more concerned over this aspect of student development than over a campus religious climate. Students, both freshmen and seniors, were least concerned.

One of the difficulties in assessing the status of real moral sensitivity among all groups, especially the younger ones, is their inherent resist-

ance to the acceptance of any presumably imposed definitions or standards, even good ones. In seeking to be fair in our judgments in this context, however, we must also note a danger of being over-optimistic, naively discounting the forces in our society which begin very early to instill in young people value scales which glorify self-aggrandizement and vulgarity. Even if the colleges were themselves more intent on moral education than they are, they would find it difficult to overcome the effects of eighteen years of youthful life in the decades of the 1960s and 1970s.

One of the most sobering insights in the entire survey came in response to the item which stated,

> The policy or approach of my college should be to encourage students to adopt Judeo-Christian values in the treatment of others.

It would be difficult to see such a statement as a threat to anyone's personal independence. Yet only one-third of the freshmen, seniors, and younger laity regarded the encouragement of Judeo-Christian values as absolutely essential or very desirable in the life of the college.

On the other hand, when requested to react to the assertion that their college should "convey the impression that students can do as they please," 46% of the freshmen and 39% of the seniors responded affirmatively. If a value stance such as this is carried out into society by four out of ten college graduates, we ought not wonder at the moral laxity which characterizes our country today.

E. The Church and the Faculty

There can be little doubt that the value and effectiveness of the educational program of any college depends upon what happens in the classroom, the laboratory, and the library. Buildings, campuses, landscapes, friendly people, campus life, high ideals – even a vital chapel and religious life program – will not, in the long run, achieve the real mission of the church in higher education, without a competent, sensitive, and committed faculty. Our survey sought to ascertain what the constituencies of LCA colleges expected of their teaching staffs, and whether their expectations in three major categories were being met. These were (1) competence as teachers, (2) commitment to the educational mission of the college, and (3) Christian commitment.

Of greatest importance among the expectations of all constituents was "teaching competence." Within the cluster of items reflecting this expectation, the item which defined good teaching as "the ability to

awaken students' intellectual involvement in a subject" received the highest rating: 93%.

Following closely in rank of importance to all groups was the expectation of the educational commitment of faculty. Such commitment included professional activities and scholarship but also close relationships with colleagues and students.

Responses concerning the third expectation, namely, that of Christian commitment, varied with the understanding of the ways in which such commitment might be manifested. A large majority expected that faculty should show concern for the moral and spiritual development of their students, as well as their intellectual growth. More than half felt faculty should support the religious program of the college, but fewer than half regarded it as essential that faculty be actively involved in a local congregation or that they understand or appreciate Lutheran theology and tradition.

Constituency responses on this expectation, as in most scales dealing with religious matters, divided quite clearly into two groupings: pastors, trustees, synod board members, and laity over 36, who were well above average; and students and non-Lutheran faculty, who scored well below average. A striking example appears in the specific item which asserts, "Most faculty at a church-related college should be professing Christians." Eighty-eight percent of the pastors and 85% of the trustees agreed, but only 34% of the students agreed. Among Lutheran faculty 67% agreed, but only 49% of the non-Lutherans agreed.

In assessing the degree to which constituencies see their expectations as being met by the colleges, we must again make apparent that many feel they have no basis for judgment. One-third of all respondents indicated "Don't know."

Among those who were able to offer a judgment, however, there was quite general satisfaction with the competence of faculty and the quality of the educational experience at LCA colleges, but somewhat less commendation of the extra-classroom involvement of the faculty, both professionally and in student-oriented activity.

By far the most pronounced disparity between expectations and perceptions relates to the Christian commitment of faculty. Those groups who register their disappointment most keenly are the pastors, synod board members, and congregational laity – whose expectations were also the highest. Senior students, who had low expectations, also rated lowest of all groups in their perception of the Christian commitment of faculty.

In one segment of the survey, all groups of constituents were asked

to describe their own religious commitment or orientation. Faculty responses provide an interesting point of comparison with the images they have established in the eyes of other constituent groups.

Of the total randomized sample of all eighteen college faculties, an 80% response was received. Approximately one-third of the 857 respondents were Lutheran. Forty-three percent of the Lutheran faculty regarded themselves as deeply religious, as compared with 26% of the non-Lutherans. Only 3% of the faculty Lutherans reported themselves as indifferent to or opposed to religion, whereas 15% of the non-Lutherans indicated their personal indifference or opposition. Eighty-five percent of the Lutheran faculty members reported themselves as participating members of congregations, while 47% of the non-Lutherans so responded.

If these percentages are extrapolated to embrace the total full-time faculties of the eighteen LCA colleges, we might have reason to be seriously concerned over the influence exerted by 263 faculty persons, Lutheran or non-Lutheran, who would identify themselves as being either indifferent or opposed to religion!

Although the presence of some non-Christians on our faculties may indeed provide a very desirable opportunity for dialogue and intellectual growth, the presence of significant numbers of teachers who actually profess indifference to as fundamental a dimension of human culture as religion probably constitutes as much of a threat to liberal education as to Christian witness.

One of the unfortunate legacies of the period of forced growth among our colleges, when teachers were scarce and enrollments were exploding, is the cadre of faculty who were added without much reference to their sensitivity to religious values or the educational goals of the institutions. Many of these are now "tenured in," and little can be done about it.

However, it is of highest importance that now, as vacancies and retirements occur, that the most careful scrutiny be given, not only to the academic credentials of faculty candidates but also to their sensitivity to the entire range of student needs – spiritual, social, and academic. It is safe to say that the future, and certainly the character of all church-related colleges, depend upon this fully as much as upon funding and enrollments.

F. The Future of College-Church Relationships

The question concerning the future of the church-related colleges is, I suppose, the question most frequently raised in any discussion of the

church's role in higher education today.

This was an area in which the survey sought especially frank and honest answers to some very pointed and crucial questions. Is the college really important to the mission of the church? Is there a growing separation between college and church? Should the church disengage itself from college support? Do people feel a sense of loyalty to their college? Do congregations lack an awareness of their college's importance?

There is a sense in which these are the "bottom line" questions. Expectations and perceptions concerning goals, programs, leadership, faculty, and students – all are based on the assumption of an ongoing relationship between the church and college, between the respondent and his or her institution. Strengths and weaknesses are assessed, but the question of whether the whole enterprise is expendable is not raised. Only in this final segment are the ultimate options introduced.

What are the responses to these options? In *all* constituency groups the conviction comes through loud and clear: that the LCA colleges *are* considered an important part of the church's mission, that the two partner institutions, college and church, *are* considered essential for each other's future. Eighty percent of *all* constituents, including pastors and congregational laity, as well as students and non-Lutheran faculty, registered agreement or strong agreement with this statement on mission. Only 10% of the entire sample disagreed.

Even fewer believe the church should *withdraw* from the college scene. In response to the statement, "The church has fulfilled its obligation to higher education and should now disengage itself from support of its colleges," only 7% expressed agreement, while a resounding 80% voted "No."

With regard to future financial support of their colleges, which may well be the "acid test" of professed loyalties and commitments, 34% of the respondents actually declared their willingness to increase their personal financial support of their colleges; an additional 26% were undecided. Unfortunately, however, no pledge cards were included with the survey instruments.

To the question of future financial support by the church, percentages were recorded as follows: Support should be substantially increased – 16%; moderately increased – 30%; maintained at present levels – 18%; moderately reduced – 3%; eliminated entirely – 2%; don't know – 30%.

Aside from the affirmation from 64% of the entire constituency that church support of colleges should be increased, or at least maintained at present levels, the large number of persons who register uncertainty is significant, especially since that number includes about half of the

clergy and four out of ten congregational laity.

A great deal of the uncertainty among the laity may well reflect a lack of information and understanding concerning their colleges. As a matter of fact, one of the clearest conclusions to be drawn from the entire survey is that there is a serious information gap between the congregations and the colleges. A specific corroboration is provided in the scale which measures "Congregational Unawareness of the College." Half the persons in the sample responded "don't know" or "undecided" to all the items in this scale. According to 25%, there *is* a congregational unawareness; about 28% say there is *not*, and about 50% don't know. Of all the groups in the sample, those adult groups most closely related to the college itself – administrators, trustees, and Lutheran faculty – are the least likely to admit that such a gap exists. This apparent lack of sensitivity on the part of college leaders may indeed be one of the factors contributing to the gap.

Finally, the survey makes it quite clear that there is a readiness for closer relationships between college and church. Specific activities calculated to promote such improvement receive strong commendation from most groups: communication among trustees, church, faculty, and students; dialogue between pastors and professors; discussion of covenant agreements between colleges and synods; communication of more information from college to congregations.

There is, without doubt, a significant reservoir of goodwill toward the church-related colleges in the LCA. There is also a stong conviction that these institutions are an important aspect of the mission of the church. It is also time that these assets must be taken more seriously by both the colleges and the leadership of the church if the survival of these institutions as partners of the church is to be assured, and if the full potential of their ministry is to be realized.

III. Interpretation and Follow-Up

Since the adoption of the Partnership Statement by the LCA and the completion of the Survey of Images and Expectations in 1976, the LCA and its colleges have sought to make practical application of their substance and findings. Both documents clearly affirm their intended uses and purposes. The Partnership Statement establishes a rationale for the church's continuing role in higher education, and the Survey reflects the expectations and perceptions of the church-relatedness of the colleges, as held by their constituencies. Both documents are seen as means for the heightening of the image of the church-related college and for

the deepening of understanding of the mission of the church in higher education. The following paragraphs describe some of the means employed by the LCA and its colleges to achieve these goals.

A. Review of Statements of Intent

Since 1970 all of the colleges of the LCA and their supporting synods have developed mutual "statements of intent" describing the nature of their relationship and outlining their mutual expectations and commitments. These statements have been reviewed periodically by the colleges and synods. One of the sections of the Partnership Statement contains a series of questions designed to assist them in evaluating the health of their relationships. Since 1976, eighteen of the twenty-two LCA-related colleges have conducted such reviews and reaffirmed their mutual commitments. In the course of these reviews, college boards of trustees, faculties, district pastors' conferences, and synod conventions have become involved in the discussion of the goals and purposes of church-related higher education.

B. Discussions and Public Presentations

Both the Partnership Statement and the Survey of Images and Expectations have been given wide publicity throughout the church and among the college constituencies since their initial publication. Forums and retreats involving faculty, administrators, and students have been conducted at most of the colleges of the LCA. Boards of trustees have made the findings of the Survey the subject of information and policy sessions. Directors of Institutional Research at several colleges have analyzed the data provided by special survey reports to individual colleges and have presented their findings to faculty, trustees, and administrators to assist in planning and policy formation. The Director of the Survey, the Chairman of the Committee which prepared the Partnership Statement, and the Director of the Department for Higher Education have presented major addresses on campuses, in church assemblies, and at educational conventions.

C. Institutional Self-Studies

At least two institutions of the LCA, Wittenberg University and Lenoir-Rhyne College, have recently completed thorough reviews of their purposes and programs in which the Partnership Statement and the Survey of Images and Expectations were utilized as primary resource documents. In its final published report, the Wittenberg Commission on Mission and Priorities adopted as the central theme of its

Statement of Mission the achievement of "wholeness of person" for each Wittenberg student. This goal also appeared in the Expectations Study as the one most highly valued by the constituencies of all LCA colleges.

D. Regional Conferences

As one of its most significant follow-up measures, the Department for Higher Education has sponsored a series of six regional conferences on church-related higher education across the entire Lutheran Church in America. Each of these conferences brings together selected members of constituency groups from each college, corresponding to the groups identified in the Images and Expectations Study. About 100 persons have attended each conference, representing four or five colleges and their supporting synods within a designated region. Major addresses interpreting both the Partnership Statement and the Survey have been presented, as well as an address dealing with the future of church-related higher education.

In each conference, special opportunities have been given for the representatives of individual colleges and of their related synods to examine together a specialized report dealing only with survey data on the constituencies of that college and synod. In this way significant leaders, including college and synod presidents, trustees, pastors, and laity, have met in open and informal discussion of key questions concerning the goals, policies, and programs of their institutions. Responses from participants in the three conferences held thus far have been very positive.

E. Publications

The LCA Statement on the Basis for Partnership Between Church and College has been published as a small brochure, which has been given wide circulation throughout the church and beyond. It is available on request from the Lutheran Church in America, Department for Higher Education, 231 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10016. Because of its technical nature, the Research Report on the Survey of Images and Expectations was printed in a very limited edition. However, an interpretive book is presently in preparation for publication by the LCA. This will provide a summary of the most significant findings of the study, in a context which should be informative not only to Lutherans but to others who may also be asking what really are the expectations and perceptions which people have of church-related colleges.

It is not possible at this time to offer an accurate assessment of the effects of these efforts on the part of the LCA and its colleges to deepen the sensitivity of their constituencies to the importance of the church's mission in higher education. The Survey itself reflects a basic climate of goodwill toward the colleges, and the regional conferences appear to confirm this impression. At the same time, it is abundantly clear that there is need for more effective communication of information and interpretation of the role of the college in the life and mission of the church. The readiness of both institutions to meet this clearly identified need will be given its most stringent test during the crisis decade just ahead.

Chapter 15

A SURVEY OF IMAGES AND EXPECTATIONS OF CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGES

Prepared by the staff of Search Institute, Minneapolis, Minnesota

How successfully are church-related colleges achieving the goals cherished by their key leaders? How important is it that a close relationship be maintained between denominational churches and their colleges?

This report addressed these questions using survey data from 411 college administrators, faculty, trustees, pastors, and church executives who gathered at Notre Dame University June 21-23, 1979, for the National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities. The report is organized around the following topics: orientation, expectations, goal areas, church relationships, and summary.

Orientation

A total of 411 Congress delegates responded to the request made of all registrants to answer a five-page questionnaire. Though not fully representative of the Congress, this sample of 57% of the delegates gives a fair estimate of how the top leaders of major denominations view their colleges.

Almost half (46%) of the respondents were college administrators, joined by trustees of their college (16%) and key faculty (13%). One-fourth of the respondents included other church executives (11%), pastors (4%), and persons representing a miscellany of roles (10%) (See Table 1).

TABLE 1
Positions of Respondents

Rank	Title	Number	Percent
1	College Administrator	182	46
2	College Trustee	62	16
3	College Faculty	51	13
4	Church Executive	45	11
5	Other	41	10
6	Pastor	17	4
Total		398	100

It was truly a national Congress with registrants coming from 44 states. Illinois furnished the largest number of respondents (10%) with Indiana coming second (7%), North Carolina third (6.75%), and Ohio fourth (5.25%). One-half of the participants came from two regions: East North Central (28.5%), and South Atlantic (21.2%). (Further details on the states from which respondents came are given in Table 2.)

TABLE 2
States and Regions of Respondents

Area	State Rank	State Number	State Percent	Region Rank	Region Number	Region Percent
East North Central				1	114	28.5
Illinois	1	40	10.0			
Indiana	2	28	7.0			
Michigan	9	14	3.5			
Ohio	4	21	5.25			
Wisconsin	10	11	2.75			
South Atlantic				2	85	21.2
District of Columbia	15	5	1.25			
Florida	13	8	2.0			
Georgia	9	14	3.5			
Maryland	13	8	2.0			
North Carolina	3	27	6.75			
South Carolina	14	6	1.5			
Virginia	8	15	3.75			
West Virginia	18	2	.5			
West North Central				3	52	13.0
Iowa	11	10	2.5			
Kansas	13	8	2.0			
Minnesota	7	16	4.0			
Missouri	12	9	2.25			
Nebraska	16	4	1.0			
North Dakota	18	2	.5			
South Dakota	17	3	.75			
Mid Atlantic				4	51	12.8
New Jersey	15	5	1.25			
New York	5	18	4.5			
Pennsylvania	2	28	7.0			
East South Central				5	30	7.5
Alabama	17	3	.75			
Kentucky	12	9	2.25			
Mississippi	17	3	.75			
Tennessee	8	15	3.75			
West South Central				6	28	7.0
Arkansas	18	2	.5			
Louisiana	17	3	.75			
Oklahoma	15	5	1.25			
Texas	5	18	4.5			
Pacific				7	24	6.0
California	6	17	4.25			
Oregon	17	3	.75			
Washington	16	4	1.0			

Area	Rank	State Number	Percent	Rank	Region Number	Percent
New England				8	9	2.3
Connecticut	18	2	.5			
Massachusetts	17	3	.75			
Maine	19	1	.25			
New Hampshire	29	1	.25			
Rhode Island	19	1	.25			
Vermont	19	1	.25			
Mountain				9	6	1.5
Colorado	19	1	.25			
Idaho	19	1	.25			
Montana	18	2	.5			
Utah	18	2	.5			
Outside the United States				10	1	.2
Alberta, Canada	19	1	.25			
Total		400	100.0		400	100.0

The largest single contingent claimed an affiliation with the Roman Catholic Church. These delegates accounted for one out of four (25.6%) at the Congress. Ranking second, with a total of 13.6%, were the representatives who identify with the United Methodist Church. Presbyterians, Lutherans, and Baptists provided an additional third (36.8%) of the respondents. Thus, five families of denominations accounted for about three out of four participants (See Table 3).

TABLE 3
Affiliation of Respondents

Rank	Church Body	Number	Percent
1	Roman Catho...	102	25.6
2	United Methodist Church	54	13.6
3	Presbyterian Church in the U.S.	40	10.1
4	American Baptist Churches of the U.S.A.	28	7.0
5	The American Lutheran Church	23	5.8
6	Lutheran Church in America	21	5.3
6	United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.	21	5.3
7	Seventh-Day Adventist	18	4.5
8	United Church of Christ	14	3.5
9	Friends United Meeting	12	3.0
9	Southern Baptist Convention	12	3.0
10	Christian Churches and Churches of Christ	11	2.8
11	Protestant Episcopal Church	9	2.3
12	Church of the Brethren	8	2.0
13	Church of the Nazarene	6	1.5
14	Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ)	5	1.3
14	General Conference Mennonite Church	5	1.3
15	Church of God (Anderson, Indiana)	3	.8
16	The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod	1	.3
16	Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints	1	.3
16	Christian Reformed Church	1	.3
16	Evangelical Free Church of America	1	.3
16	Evangelical Covenant Church of America	1	.3
16	Other	1	.3
	*Unidentified Affiliation	13	3.0
Total		411	100.0

*Statistics are based only on those claiming affiliation

The predominant age of the respondents were 50 to 64 years of age. This age group, when joined by delegates 40 to 49 years old, accounted for four out of five delegates present.

The five-page survey instrument used 48 items from a questionnaire developed by Search Institute for A Survey of Images and Expectations of Lutheran (LCA) Colleges.* The first 36 items were taken from a section in the questionnaire which assesses people's expectations and perceptions. An additional 12 items were selected from a number of agree-disagree statements on college-church relationships. Five separate questions secured identifying information with respect to sex, age, state of residency, college position, and church body. Though the analyses allow for comparisons between subgroups formed by these items as well as comparisons with the LCA colleges, this report is limited to highlight data.

Expectations

What important goals do those who attended the Congress cherish most for their colleges?

This important question served as the precipitating reason for asking respondents to rate the importance of 36 goal statements. This enabled delegates to identify the priorities they hold with respect to their colleges. The following instructions were given the delegates:

As you respond to the following items, do so with your focus on the college you know best in the church body whose colleges you represent.

Indicate what you think your college SHOULD BE – using the number which tells how important this goal is in your view. You may use one of six numbers:

6=Absolutely Essential	3=Somewhat Desirable
5=Very Desirable	2=Neither Desirable/Undesirable
4=Quite Desirable	1=Undesirable

The following items received the highest ratings from the 411 respondents of the Congress:

Rank	Item No.	Goal Statement
1	19.	Foster growth for moral responsibility.

*Copyright by Division for Mission in North America, Lutheran Church in America. For further information about the instrument, or for additional intepretation of this report, contact the Search Institute, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Rank	Item No.	Goal Statement
2	1.	Help students do the best they can to fulfill their potentials and accept their limitations.
3	27.	Seek academic excellence in all departments of the college.
4	4.	Offer commitment to the Christian faith as an important option for life.

Ratings on these goals show that Congress delegates view these as being somewhere between "absolutely essential" and "very desirable."

The four goals drawing the lowest ratings (a little less than "quite desirable") include two which are vocationally oriented:

Rank	Item No.	Goal Statement
33	34.	Seek as a college to contribute directly to the solution of community problems.
34	30.	Prepare students for specific jobs and occupations.
35	15.	Equip students to become leaders of congregations.
36	33.	Prepare students for church occupations.

Disparities. Respondents, having rated the 36 goal statements in terms of their ideal of what a church-related college should be like, then indicated their perceptions of how well these goals are being achieved in the denominational college they know best. These ratings reflect their image of how well church-related colleges are meeting the 36 goals (6=Excellent, 5=Very Good, 4=Good, 3=Adequate, 2=Only Fair/Not So Good, 1=Poor). Disparities are visually apparent between the "is" and the "should be." Significantly, goals deemed most important are the ones where disparities are usually the greatest. Listed below are the ten goals where distance is greatest between ideal and reality, in order of decreasing disparities.

Rank	Disparity Score	Item No.	Goal Statement
1	1.756	4.	Offer commitment to the Christian faith as an important option for life.
2	1.686	6.	Help students integrate intellectual knowledge, ethical sensitivity, and concrete action.

Rank	Disparity Score	Item No.	
3	1.676	19.	Foster growth for moral responsibility.
4	1.582	18.	Establish thoughtful, critical interaction between the theology of the Christian church and other academic disciplines.
5	1.479	12.	Foster understanding of the teachings of Christ.
6	1.420	24.	Provide a place for a genuine encounter between religious faith and secular learning where each enhances the other.
7	1.405	36.	Create a concern for the welfare of all humankind.
8	1.394	3.	Equip students to establish creative relationships with peoples and cultures different from their own.
9	1.377	2.	Establish community life where students learn to care about others.
10	1.348	20.	Provide the understanding and skills needed in working for constructive changes in society.

Six Goal Areas

Inasmuch as a previous study involving 6,428 respondents showed that the 36 items used here cluster around six goal concepts, the goal statements are classified accordingly:

Preparation for Life	Christian Perspective
Wholeness of Person	Social Change
Liberal Arts Education	Dialogue Within Diversity

Analysis which follow are based upon scores derived from answers to items within each of these goal areas or scales.

Wholeness of Person. Highest ranked is the expectation that colleges should actively seek to educate in a way that furthers personal integration and growth in students in non-cognitive as well as cognitive areas. Items clustering around this expectation speak about learning to care about others, gaining self-understanding, establishing creative relationships, developing potential, integrating theory and practice, and developing attitudes for learning (see Table 4).

The significance of this concept is found in the widely held expectation that one's college not restrict its efforts to furthering intellectual

virtues. Rather, close to nine out of ten persons expect their college to seek for its students those human virtues that make for personhood.

TABLE 4
College Goal: Wholeness of Person

Item	Percentage of Total Group Answering: Absolutely Essential	Very Desirable	Total
2. Establish community life where students learn to care about others.	43%	46%	89%
10. Help students gain self-understanding.	42	43	85
3. Equip students to establish creative relationships with people and cultures different from their own.	20	44	64
1. Help students do the best they can to fulfill their potential and accept their limitations.	63	30	93
6. Help students integrate intellectual knowledge, ethical sensitivity, and concrete action.	51	41	92
19. Foster growth for moral responsibility.	62	35	97
Average Percentage Response	47%	40%	87%

If these are the goals coveted most for church-related colleges, they are (in the eyes of their leaders) the furthest from realization. None of the other goal areas shows as great a disparity between what is desired and what is being realized. Among these, the individual goal for which the disparity is greatest is: "Help students integrate intellectual knowledge, ethical sensitivity, and concrete action." The disparity between image and expectation for this item is seen as second largest for all 36 goal statements.

Liberal Arts Education. This expectation, which ranks second in importance, is another traditional goal of church-related colleges. Its items point toward an education that fosters appreciation of the cultural and intellectual history of the ages, enables students to gain a general knowledge of the fine arts along with a variety of other academic subjects, develops imaginative and analytical thinking, and inspires a positive attitude toward life-long learning. Three out of four persons in the total sample rate these statements of goal as "absolutely essential" or "very desirable" (see Table 5).

Nine out of ten especially stress the importance of providing a high quality liberal arts education and of seeking academic excellence in all departments of the college.

This concept of what church-related colleges should be like ranks second in how successfully its goals are perceived as being achieved. Hence, the disparity between ideal and reality is next to the lowest (fifth) of the six goal areas. None of its items shows large differences between "is" and "should be".

TABLE 5
College Goal: Liberal Arts Education

Item	Percentage of Total Group Answering: Absolutely Essential	Very Desirable	Total
21. Foster appreciation of the cultural and intellectual history of the ages.	25%	44%	69%
17. Enable students to gain a general knowledge of the fine arts.	12	36	48
7. Provide a high quality liberal arts education.	51	37	88
13. Give students familiarity with a broad variety of academic subjects.	31	41	72
5. Develop imaginative and analytical thinking.	44	46	90
27. Seek academic excellence in all departments of the college.	61	29	90
8. Inspire a positive attitude toward life-long learning.	28	48	76
Average Percentage Response	36%	40%	76%

Dialogue Within Diversity. Items which center in the goal of theological dialogue within the context of religious diversity are ranked third in importance. They indicate the desire of four out of five college leaders for an atmosphere of intellectual freedom where the Christian faith is considered in dialogue with other beliefs, where there is inquiry into religious and ethical questions, and where there is encounter between the Christian faith and secular learning. Seven out of ten give the five items listed in Table 6 a high rating of importance. This goal area ranks third also in how well it is being achieved. However, two of its items ranked fourth and sixth among the 36 goal statements with respect to the disparity between the "is" and the "should be." The items are these:

Rank	Disparity Score	Item No.	Goal Statement
4	1.582	18.	Establish thoughtful, critical interaction between the theology of the Christian church and other academic disciplines.
6	1.420	24.	Provide a place for a genuine encounter between religious faith and secular learning where each enhances the other.

Christian Perspective. Another expectation finds expression in the goal of helping students adopt or sharpen a life perspective that centers in Christianity. As Table 7 shows, four out of five say it is "absolutely essential" or "very desirable" to provide opportunities for growth and affirmation in the Christian faith, to foster understanding

of the teachings of Christ, and to provide an academic setting for people who are committed to being scholars and Christians at the same time. Nine out of ten accord high importance to the goals of providing a quality education with a Christian perspective and of offering commitment to the Christian faith as an important option for life. Only one out of four, however, believe the college should equip students to become leaders of congregations or prepare them for church occupations. Clearly, the expectation is that a church-related college will provide opportunities for students to arrive at an ultimate interpretative scheme that gives order, meaning, and direction to one's life. The intended purpose should be to foster growth in students' understanding of and relationship to Jesus Christ.

TABLE 6
College Goal: Dialogue within Diversity

Item	Percentage of Total Group Answering: Absolutely Essential	Very Desirable	Total
11. Seek religious diversity among faculty and students while maintaining the Christian orientation of the college.	14%	26%	40%
9. Provide an atmosphere of intellectual freedom where the Christian faith is considered in dialogue with other beliefs.	37	38	75
18. Establish thoughtful, critical interaction between the theology of the Christian church and other academic disciplines.	26	46	72
23. Encourage inquiry into religious and ethical questions.	46	42	88
24. Provide a place for a genuine encounter between religious faith and secular learning where each enhances the other.	36	42	78
Average Percentage Response	32%	39%	71%

These items, which tie for third in importance with Dialogue Within Diversity, reflect the most controversy. They draw the greatest range of ratings in importance and the greatest range of ratings in how well these goals are being achieved.

The area where disparities are second greatest between the "is" and "should be" is this goal area, Christian perspective. The item showing greatest disparity of all 36 goal statements is the expectation that one's college would "offer commitment to the Christian faith as an important option for life."

Preparation for Life. The expectation that one's college prepare students for life ranks fifth in importance. The four items which intercorrelate around this expectation reflect an emphasis on preparing

people for specific jobs or occupations, giving mastery over a specialized field of knowledge, and developing competent leaders in society. The goal of educating the mind is also associated with these vocation- and service-oriented emphases. It may seem strange that the items of Table 8 do inter-correlate. Yet, in another study we found that they do cluster because students, parents, and certain off-campus constituency groups associate them together. A glance at the table shows how unevenly they are viewed by college leaders. Only one in four consider it important to prepare students for specific jobs and occupations.

TABLE 7
College Goal: Christian Perspective

Item	Percentage of Total Group Answering: Absolutely Essential	Very Desirable	Total
25. Provide opportunities for growth in the Christian faith.	51%	33%	84%
26. Help students affirm their personal commitment to Christ.	36	28	64
12. Foster understandings of the teachings of Christ.	49	31	80
32. Provide quality education with a Christian perspective.	60	30	90
4. Offer commitment to the Christian faith as an important option for life.	62	27	89
35. Demonstrate as a college the sacredness of a secular world governed by God, the creator.	26	32	58
22. Provide an academic setting for people who are committed to being scholars and Christians at the same time.	45	35	80
15. Equip students to become leaders of congregations.	6	21	27
31. Prepare students for church occupations.	6	17	23
Average Percentage Response.	38%	28%	66%

Though these goal statements are ranked fifth in importance by the delegates, these goals statements are ranked first in how well they are being achieved. The disparity between image and expectation for these items is lowest for the six goal areas. Here the nation's church-related colleges come the closest to meeting the expectations of church leaders.

TABLE 8
College Goal: Preparation for Life

Item	Percentage of Total Group Answering: Absolutely Essential	Very Desirable	Total
30. Prepare students for specific jobs and occupations.	8%	17%	25%
29. Educate the mind.	52	31	83
14. Enable students to gain some mastery over a specialized field of knowledge.	28	44	72
28. Develop competent leaders who will make a contribution to society.	35	46	81
Average Percentage Response.	31%	35%	65%

Social Change. A sixth goal expectation is that one's college will contribute to the solution of social ills by equipping individuals of all ages with the necessary skills for working toward constructive changes in society. As indicated in Table 9, this is another area of considerable disagreement.

TABLE 9
College Goal: Social Change

Item	Percentage of Total Group Answering: Absolutely Essential	Very Desirable	Total
34. Seek as a college to contribute directly to the solution of community problems.	8%	22%	30%
31. Help people from low economic communities acquire knowledge and skills for improving their own communities.	12	36	48
20. Provide the understanding and skills needed in working for constructive changes in society.	27	46	73
36. Create a concern for the welfare of all humankind.	48	38	86
16. Provide continuing education for all ages.	10	25	35
Average Percentage Response.	21%	33%	54%

Only a third feel it is important that their college become directly involved in helping solve community problems or providing continuing education for all ages. But 73% deem it of high importance to prepare students to make constructive changes in society and 86% to create a concern for the welfare of humankind.

These items, which are ranked lowest in importance, are also ranked lowest in achievement, with an average rating of "adequate." Clearly, there is little interest among the majority of college leaders to subordinate the major task of being an educational institution to becoming a social agency.

Church Relationships

The last 12 items of the five-page questionnaire probe aspects of the church-college relationship and address many of the questions that are frequently raised about this relationship. Respondents indicated their opinion regarding each statement by responding with strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree.

Are the colleges viewed as important to the mission of the church? The answer given is an overwhelming yes: Virtually all, 94%, agree that the church-related college is an important vehicle through which the church can fulfill its mission (item 37, see Table 10). Of those agreeing,

61% indicate strong agreement. Similarly, 87% agree "the church should see its colleges as an extension of mission and an integral part of the work of the church" (item 42). Church executives are almost unanimous in their affirmation of both items.

TABLE 10
Percentage of Agreement
Regarding College-Church Relationships

	Str. Agr.	Agree	Un-dec.	Dis-agr.	Str. Dis.
37. The church-related college is an important vehicle through which the church can fulfill its mission.	61%	33%	4%	2%	1%
38. Religious affiliation causes some curtailment of intellectual freedom for faculty and students.	2	15	2	47	34
39. Our colleges are drifting further and further from the church.	6	33	16	39	6
40. My denomination has fulfilled its obligation to higher education and should now disengage itself from support of its colleges.	1	1	3	19	76
41. I see the colleges of my denomination as being distinctly Christian in character and emphasis.	16	42	24	15	3
42. The church should see its colleges as an extension of mission and an integral part of the work of the church.	49	38	5	7	1
43. The college differs from the church in that its primary task is not redemption but rather to focus on the truth about creation.	14	41	18	20	8
44. The religious commitment of my denominational colleges is clear and well known to me.	22	41	15	18	3
45. A college should not be viewed as a tool to solve the pressing problems of church or society, but rather as an agency to educate persons who later can solve problems.	21	43	9	23	4
46. Members of our congregations lack an awareness of the contribution of our colleges.	30	57	4	9	1
47. The college should include in its curriculum some courses which grow directly out of the needs of the churches.	15	53	18	13	1
48. The church should be involved in the governance of its colleges through representation on their boards of trustees.	37	48	7	6	2

Is this close tie with the church seen as a restriction on the intellectual freedom of faculty and students? The majority of the delegates (81%) say no, with faculty being especially adamant. Nine out of ten, (90%) disagree with the statement that "religious affiliation causes some curtailment of intellectual freedom for faculty and students" (item 38).

Are the colleges seen as drifting away from the church? Opinion divides on this matter, with 39% agreeing, 45% disagreeing, and 16% saying they are undecided. It is significant that trustees, the ones charged with giving direction to the colleges, are most convinced that such a drift is occurring: Nearly one-half, 49%, agree with the statement that "our colleges are drifting further and further from the church" (item 39). A total of 45% of faculty join them in this opinion.

Are the colleges losing their distinctive quality? The majority (58%) say no (item 41). Only 18% do not "see the colleges of (my) denomination as being distinctly Christian in character and emphasis." However, a fourth (24%) are undecided about this item.

The majority, however, increases to 63% of those agreeing that "the religious commitment of my denominational colleges is clear and well known" (item 44). Only 36% disagree or are undecided about this statement.

Should financial support continue? The answer is unambiguous. A total of 95% reject the idea that "my denomination has fulfilled its obligation to higher education and should now disengage itself from support of its colleges" (item 40). A high percentage (76%) express strong disagreement.

How does the mission of the college differ from the mission of the church? Here there is disagreement: Slightly more than one-half, 55%, believe that the college differs from the church in that its primary task is not to redeem but rather to focus on the truth about creation (item 43). The remainder either disagree (28%) or are undecided (18%). Convictions regarding this statement vary considerably by position. College administrators show greatest agreement (67%) with the item and their trustees least agreement (39%). Strongest disagreement is found among the trustees (36%) and delegates classified as pastors or others (40%). A relatively large proportion of church executives (29%) are undecided regarding their opinion on this mission statement.

Similarly, disagreement appears over the role of colleges in meeting some of the urgent problems of church and society. Three out of four administrators (73%) feel that "a college should not be viewed as a tool to solve the pressing problems of church or society, but rather as an agency to educate persons who later can solve problems" (item 45). Taking an opposing position are 35% of their faculty and 51% of the pastors and others group.

Are members of congregations aware of what their colleges are accomplishing? The answer is a resounding "no." Most (87%) agree that "members of our congregations lack an awareness of the contribution

of our colleges" (item 46). Fewer of the faculty (70%), however, feel this is so.

It may be concern over closer ties with congregations that causes a surprisingly large percentage (68%) to agree that "the college should include in its curriculum some courses which grow directly out of the needs of the churches" (item 47). Church executives show greatest enthusiasm for the idea, with 76% agreeing and 13% remaining undecided.

Should the church be involved in the governance of its colleges? Again the answer is unequivocal: Almost all, 85%, agree this should occur "through representation on their boards of trustees" (item 48). The ones in strongest agreement with this method of involvement are church executives (51%) and the pastors and others group (50%).

Summary

Fifty-seven percent of the leaders who assembled June 21-23, 1979, for the National Congress of Church-Related Colleges and Universities at Notre Dame University answered a five-page questionnaire prepared for the occasion. These delegates from 44 states and at least 23 denominations represented the top leadership of church-related colleges in the United States. Almost half (46%) of the respondents were college administrators, with an additional 29% being trustees or faculty.

A major purpose of the survey was to identify the goals which the leaders cherish most and least for their colleges. Ranking highest in importance among 36 goal statements is the goal of fostering "growth for moral responsibility." Ranking lowest is the goal of "preparing students for church occupations."

A second purpose was to identify where disparities were greatest and least between what a college "should be" and "is." Usually the distance between image and expectations is greatest for goals viewed as being of highest importance. The delegates reflect greatest disparity in their responses to the goal, "offers commitment to the Christian faith as an important option for life." Least disparity in responses shows for the goal of "preparing students for specific jobs and occupations."

A third purpose was to identify the emphases deemed of greatest and least importance for church-related colleges. Six emphases were identified as goal areas based on how the 36 statements tended to cluster. The survey shows that goal statements revolving around the concept of "wholeness of person" are viewed as highest in importance. However, it is also a goal area where differences between image and expectations are greatest.

The goal area ranked second in importance is Liberal Arts Education. This traditional emphasis of church-related colleges is seen as being achieved with "good" success – below "excellent" or "very good." Disparity between ideal and reality for this goal area ranks next to the lowest (fifth).

Dialogue Within Diversity is the goal of theological dialogue within the context of religious diversity. Its rank in importance as an emphasis on campus and the rank of its differences between the "is" and "should be" are third.

Greatest variation in opinion revolves around goal statements classified under Christian Perspective. This goal area, ranked fourth in importance, has the greatest variation in its ratings of importance.

A final goal was to answer a series of oft-raised questions regarding a college-church relationship. Information germane to these questions was found in delegate responses to 12 agree-disagree statements.

Overwhelming agreement was given to the importance of church-related colleges. They are seen as being an extension of the church's mission and an integral part of the work of the church. Though closely tied, this relationship is not seen as curtailing the intellectual freedom of faculty and students.

Difference of opinion appears with respect to several key issues. Some delegates, especially trustees and faculty, feel the college-church relationship is being eroded by a drift away from original commitments and the blurring of a distinctive Christian perspective. On another issue, some take opposing positions on how the mission of the college differs from that of the church. A large minority differ with the stance of the college administrators who as a majority believe, (1) that the primary task of the college centers on the truth about creation and not redemption; and (2) that a college is not a tool for solving societal problems, but rather an agency for educating persons who can later solve problems.

A striking need appears in the widespread opinion of delegates that members of congregations lack an awareness of the contribution of their colleges. Most favor the idea that some of the courses offered in colleges grow out of the needs of the churches.

One can conclude that the assembled delegates hold deep convictions regarding the importance of church-related colleges in today's world.

SECTION V
Contributors

EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES AND PROGRAMS

Authors

Edgar M. Carlson, Chair
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Harry E. Smith
President
Austin College
Sherman, Texas

David Burrell
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

Critique Members

Louis Almen
President
Thiel College
Greenville, Pennsylvania

William Bennett
Executive Officer
National Humanities Center
Research Triangle Park,
North Carolina

Neal R. Berte
President
Birmingham-Southern College
Birmingham, Alabama

Thomas S. Field
President
William Jewell College
Liberty, Missouri

Shirley Heckman
Parish Ministries Commission
Church of the Brethren
Elgin, Illinois

J. Donald Monan, S.J.
President
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

Paul Mininger
Goshen, Indiana

Robert Mullinax
Executive Secretary
Council on Christian Higher Education
North Carolina Convention
Raleigh, North Carolina

Glenn L. Nelson
Vice President and Dean of the College
Luther College
Decorah, Iowa

Robert A. Nicholson
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Anderson College
Anderson, Indiana

Samuel R. Spencer, Jr.
President
Davidson College
Davidson, North Carolina

ISSUES OF SOCIETY

Authors

William J. Byron, S.J.
President
University of Scranton
Scranton, Pennsylvania

J. Rodney Fulcher
Director of Higher Education Emphasis
Presbyterian Church, US
Atlanta, Georgia

Patrick Hill
Department of Philosophy
State University of New York at Stoney Brook
Long Island, New York

Merle Longwood
Professor of Religion and Ethics
Siena College
Loudonville, New York

Richard McBrien
Professor of History
Holy Cross College
Worcester, Massachusetts

Clyde Lee Miller
Department of Philosophy
State University of New York at
Stony Brook
Long Island, New York

William Nelsen
Association of American Colleges
Washington, D.C.

David O'Brien
Professor of History
College of the Holy Cross
Worcester, Massachusetts

Edward Wright, Jr.
Cambridge, Maryland

Critique Members

William R. Belli
Educational Ministries
American Baptist Church
Valley Forge, Pennsylvania

Lupe de Leon
Secretary of Home Missions
Mennonite Board of Missions
Elkhart, Indiana

Pope Duncan
President
Stetson University
Deland, Florida

R. Kirby Godsey
Academic Vice President
Mercer University
Macon, Georgia

Andrew M. Greeley
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Walter J. Leonard
President
Fisk University
Nashville, Tennessee

James Earl Massey
Speaker of Christian Brotherhood Hour
Mass Communication Board
Church of God
Anderson, Indiana

Viggo N. Olsen
President
Loma Linda University
Loma Linda, California

Larry Osnes
Dean for Academic Development
and Public Affairs
Anderson College
Anderson, Indiana

James Potter
Pastor
Pritchard Memorial Baptist Church
Charlotte, North Carolina

George Telford, Jr.
Director
Division of Social and Corporate Mission
General Assembly Mission Board
Atlanta, Georgia

William D. Weatherford
President
Berea College
Berea, Kentucky

FORMS OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHURCH AND COLLEGE

Authors

James Barrett
Executive Secretary of Higher Education
United Methodist Church
Nashville, Tennessee

Robert Rue Parsonage
Associate Director
Education in Society
National Council of Churches
New York, New York

Richard Solberg
Director
Department of Higher Education
Lutheran Church of America
New York, New York

Dan C. West
President
Arkansas College
Batesville, Arkansas

Critique Members

Donald A. Courtney
Executive Secretary-Treasurer
Board of Higher Education
Church of God
Anderson, Indiana

Richard Davis
Professor Christian Ethics
Earlham College
Richmond, Indiana

Albert J. Meyer
Director
Educational Development
Mennonite Board of Education
Elkhart, Indiana

William Fogleman
General Presbyter
Synod of Red River
Presbyterian Church, US
Denton, Texas

Warner L. Hall
Charlotte, North Carolina

Aubrey Hawkins
Chairman
Division of Higher Education
Georgia Baptist State Convention
Atlanta, Georgia

Carl H. Lundquist
President
Bethel College
St. Paul, Minnesota

Verlin Kruschwitz
Pastor
Serverns Valley Baptist Church
Elizabethtown, Kentucky

Jonathan Messerli
President
Susquehanna University
Selinsgrove, Pennsylvania

Terrence J. Murphy
President
College of St. Thomas
St. Paul, Minnesota

Robert Reardon
President
Anderson College
Anderson, Indiana

Josephy G. Smoot
President
Andrews University
Berrian Springs, Michigan

The Twenty-Three Participating Denominations

African Methodist Episcopal Church
American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A.
American Lutheran Church
Christian Church
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church
Church of the Brethren
Church of Christ
Church of God
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints
Church of the Nazarene
The Episcopal Church
Free Methodist Church of North America
Lutheran Church in America
Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod
Mennonite Church
Presbyterian Church, U.S.
Religious Society of Friends
Roman Catholic Church
Seventh-Day Adventists
Southern Baptist Convention
United Church of Christ
United Methodist Church
United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
Also included is the Christian College Coalition